1-1-1991

A comparative study of teachers' attitudes toward parent involvement in the schools.

Joseph E. Arsenault
University of Massachusetts Amherst

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE SCHOOLS

A Dissertation Presented

by

JOSEPH E. ARSENAULT JR.

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May, 1991

School of Education

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE SCHOOLS

A Dissertation Presented

by

JOSEPH E. ARSENAULT JR.

Approved as to style and content by:

Harvey B. Scribner, Chairman

Robert W. Maloy, Member

Warren F. Schumacher, Member

Marilyn Haring-Hidore, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to the memory of Bret Mackedon, Peter Oddie, and Danny Flannigan. These three young men were very special friends who never got their chance to live a dream. It seems only appropriate that I should share mine with them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A project of this magnitude can only be accomplished with the support and encouragement of many individuals. With this thought in mind, I wish to express my gratitude to the following people.

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the time and effort of Dr. Harvey Scribner, chairman of my doctoral committee, for his constant support and enthusiasm throughout this process. Without his guidance, this accomplishment would not have been possible. My fondest memories of this project will always be the discussions of educational issues with Harvey.

My sincere appreciation is also extended to Dr. Robert Maloy and Dr. Warren Schumacher, members of my doctoral committee, for their patience and assistance with the study. Their interest and expertise concerning parent participation with the schools enhanced this study in so many ways.

I also wish to thank Dr. Paul A. Squarcia, Silver Lake Regional School District Superintendent of Schools, for all of the time and energy he generously

shared with me during this study. His guidance and understanding of the dissertation process kept me on task when it could have been easy to become distracted.

My friend, Dr. Steven Greenberg, was always there whenever I needed assistance with the precise art of writing a dissertation or just someone to talk to about life as a doctoral candidate. His support and the patience of his lovely wife Patty will be cherished memories always.

I also want to thank my computer "guru", Mr. Sid Russell, who provided me with the technical support needed in order to survive in the confusing world of statistical analysis.

No words can adequately express my appreciation to my parents for their assistance and support during this study. Their enthusiasm was contagious and their willingness to do anything made the work so much easier.

So many other people were kind and helpful to me during this project that it would be impossible to remember each one individually. However, please be assured that your thoughtfulness did not go unnoticed. Thank you for everything.

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE SCHOOLS

MAY 1991

JOSEPH E. ARSENAULT JR., B.S.Ed., BOSTON STATE COLLEGE
M.Ed., BOSTON STATE COLLEGE
Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
Directed by: Professor Harvey B. Scribner

A study of two hundred and fifty (250) public school teachers employed in a partial regional school district was conducted in order to examine their attitudes toward various forms of parent participation with the schools. Teachers were asked to respond to a fifty (50) statement survey investigating seven categories of parent involvement. These categories included: parent and teacher relationships; parents as supporters; parents as an audience; parents as decision makers; parents as advocates; parents as tutors for their children; and parents as learners.

The purpose of the study was to determine if any differences in attitude existed among these teachers concerning parent participation in the schools. Comparisons were made among the teachers according to

grade level, educational background, age, family status, formal training for parent involvement, years of service, and gender.

Several interesting patterns emerged from this investigation. The results indicated that there are significant differences among teachers at the elementary, junior high, and high school levels toward parent involvement with the schools.

Elementary school teachers revealed more positive attitudes toward parent involvement than junior high and high school teachers in the areas of parent and teacher relationships, parents as supporters of the schools, and parents as tutors assisting their children with school related activities.

Significant differences surfaced between elementary school and the junior high teachers concerning parents as an audience for school activities. High school and junior high teachers disagreed concerning the role of parents as learners in the schools.

Other factors also influenced teacher attitudes toward parent participation. A significant difference surfaced between teachers who had received training for parent involvement activities and those who had not

participated in any training programs. Teachers who are parents also held views that differed from those who are not parents concerning parent involvement. Examination of the teacher responses by gender revealed that the attitudes of male and female teachers differed concerning parent participation with the schools.

Age, years of experience, and educational background did not significantly affect the attitudes of the teachers toward parent involvement with the schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

Introduction

Recent studies have taken a close and revealing look at parent involvement in public schools. Although this is not a new innovation, changes in the laws governing education coupled with increased dissatisfaction with the present quality of schools have led to recent revitalization of this concept as one of many strategies to improve public education. Ernest Boyer (1990), president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching recently proposed, "Let's declare that - during the decade of the 90's - our goal will be to have all parents become full partners in the education of their children".

The research suggests that parents are the child's first and most important teacher, and usually the most permanent influence on a child's life (Coleman, 1966; Shaefer, 1971; Gordon, 1972; Mize, 1977). There is also evidence to suggest that the effect that even the best schools has on children is limited by comparison to the home (Epstein, 1987).

Studies imply that the relationship between family background and student success is more

significant than the connection between the quality of schools and student attainment (Coleman, 1983). Influencing factors include family size, family structure, birth order, spacing of children, nutrition, parental education and employment, communication, and parent expectations for school performance (Scott-Jones, 1985).

These studies emphasize that the background and environment of children is critical to the learning process. The evidence also indicates that children can be successful in school, regardless of environmental factors, when parents are involved with the educational process.

A 1987 study by the U.S. Department of Education examined research contrasting the family life of high and low scoring poor, minority youngsters. The results indicated that high scoring students had regular chores, homework schedules, and that their parents regularly involved them in conversations, games, singing, and other activities. The low achieving students had few home responsibilities, less parental supervision, and infrequent family interaction with the schools.

The benefits of parent involvement with their children's education are not limited to the elementary

grades. Activities such as monitoring a child's whereabouts, supervising homework and talking with students each day were linked to increased student grade achievement among over 30,000 sophmores and 28,000 seniors in public and private schools (National Center for Statistics Bulletin, March 1985).

In addition to improving student achievement, the evidence reveals that parent involvement can influence attendance, student motivation, self-esteem, and behavior in school (Herman & Yeh, 1983). Research also suggests that parents who are involved in the schools demonstrate higher levels of satisfaction with both the school and their own children's achievement.

Even though parent involvement of any kind appears to improve student performance, studies reveal that parents are not as involved in the schools today as they were in the past. Where parents were traditionally involved with the schools that their children attended, many are no longer readily available to help out in schools and some appear to feel alienated (Moles, 1983).

Some parents may lack the motivation to be more involved with the schools because they no longer feel confident that what they say or do will make a difference (Frymier, 1987). Furthermore, even if they

do become involved, many parents cannot be consistent in their efforts because of job and other family demands (Elkind, 1982). VanDevender (1988) suggests that a breakdown in family life and the mobility in our society also contribute to lack of parental support for schools. In some cases parents do not even live in the community where their child's school is located.

Lightfoot (1978) proposes that home-school relations are inherently in conflict. She believes that different priorities and perceptions of families and schools will create conflict over the means of attaining common goals. She sees collaboration as a one way process with schools seldom accommodating to family needs.

Since there is evidence to suggest that parents are becoming more distant from the schools, more effective strategies for involving parents must be developed. "Failure to find new approaches may serve to perpetuate rather than break the intergenerational cycle of school failure" (Raynolds, 1990).

Many studies indicate that teachers play a key role in determining the amount of parent involvement in the schools. The approach taken by the staff to build a relationship between programs and parents determines the level of parent involvement (Dove, 1982). Parent

involvement appears to increase when teachers reach out and make parents feel that their involvement is important and has an impact on the students' education (Lally, 1985).

While there is ample evidence to suggest that the involvement of parents in their child's education can improve students performance, there appears to be limited research examining teachers' attitudes toward parent involvement in the schools. Furthermore, much of the current research appears to focus on the attitudes of elementary school teachers hence leaving evidence relative to parent involvement with secondary students as sparse.

In a California study in 1977, the relationship between the attitudes of early childhood teachers and their subsequent behaviors toward parent involvement was investigated . It was determined that those teachers having positive attitudes concerning parent involvement tended to involve parents more in the educational process (Tudor, 1977).

Researchers in Maryland conducted a survey of first, third, and fifth grade teachers to measure how elementary school teachers and principals felt about parent involvement in home learning as a teaching strategy and to see how widespread this teaching

strategy was. Their findings indicate that although the majority of the teachers agreed that parent involvement is a good idea, over half of them had serious doubts about the success of practical efforts to involve parents in the schools (Becker & Epstein, 1982).

Another study conducted by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (Williams, 1982) examined the attitudes of elementary school teachers and principals regarding specific parent involvement activities in the schools. This research determined that elementary school teachers and principals had a favorable attitude toward what they referred to as traditional parent involvement activities i.e., helping with homework, attending conferences, working as aides, supporting the teachers, etc. However, the teachers and principal were generally negative toward parent involvement which required parents as advocates and decision makers.

In as much as teachers attitudes might influence their willingness to involve parents in all schools, this researcher believed it was important to examine elementary, junior high school, and high school teachers attitudes about parent involvement.

Statement of the Problem

From the research it appears that parent involvement improves student achievement at all levels of children's formal education. The literature also indicates that teachers need to do more to involve parents in the process of education. However, studies examining teachers' attitudes appear to have been limited to certain teachers, administrators and other school officials. Since the literature does not appear to contain any conclusive evidence to suggest that teachers at all levels maintain similar views, it would appear that research examining the attitudes of teachers at elementary, junior and senior high could add to the body of knowledge regarding teachers' attitudes toward parent involvement in the schools and potentially impact educational policy.

Purpose of the Study

Since there is evidence to suggest that attitudes are correlated with actions, the purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of teachers from all grade levels in a partial regional school district concerning parent involvement in the schools. Variables that were considered included:

- Parent and teacher relationships;
- Parents as decision makers in the schools;
- Parents as supporter in the schools;
- Parents as advocates for children;
- Parents assisting students with school work at home;
- Parents as an audience for school programs;
- Parents as learners in the schools;

The study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What are the attitudes of elementary, junior high, and high school teachers in a partial regional school district regarding the value of parent involvement in the schools;
2. What roles do teachers in a partial regional school district think that parents should play in the schools;
3. In what decisions do teachers in a partial regional school district think parents should have input;
4. How are these feelings regarding parent involvement alike and/or different among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers;

5. Do any of the following factors influence teacher attitudes concerning parent involvement:
   A - professional training;
   B - years of service;
   C - age of teacher;
   D - marital status of teacher;
   E - whether or not the teacher is a parent.
6. What implications may be drawn from this study which might improve parent involvement programs?

Significance of the Study

Much has been written about the importance of involving parents in the education of their children. Studies have consistently linked parental involvement with higher student grades and test scores, more positive student attitudes and behaviors, and improved school climates (Jennings, 1990).

The literature suggests that increasing parent involvement is the task of all teachers but there appears to be much debate among teachers as to what constitutes effective parent involvement. While some teachers believe that they need parental assistance with many learning activities in order to be effective, others think that their professional status is in jeopardy if parents are involved in activities that are typically the teachers' responsibility (Epstein, 1986).

This study identified roles that Silver Lake Regional School District teachers believed were important for parents to assume.

Since the studies examining teachers' attitudes toward parent involvement do not appear to consider teacher variables such as grade level and training, it was a topic that deserved additional research.

Decisions affecting the Silver Lake School District are made by six separate school boards that are not always in agreement. The professional staff is also represented by five separate teachers' associations. These factors have occasionally resulted in an "us against them" attitude among staff members in the four member towns. A study of teacher attitudes throughout the region might provide information that could be employed in efforts to coordinate and improve parent involvement programs.

Hypotheses

The approach used in this study to investigate the problem included the testing of a series of hypotheses that focus on teachers attitudes toward parent involvement in the schools. The specific hypotheses investigated in this study were:

1. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers regarding parent and teacher relationships in the school;

2. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as decision makers in the school;

3. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as supporters in the school;

4. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as advocates for children;

5. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents assisting students with school work;

6. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as an audience in the schools;

7. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as learners in the school;

8. There are no significant differences in attitude among teachers with different levels of professional training toward parent involvement in the school;

9. There are no significant differences in attitude among different age teachers toward parent involvement in the schools;

10. There are no significant differences in attitude among teachers who are and are not parents concerning parent involvement in the schools;

11. There are no significant difference in attitude toward parent involvement between teachers who have received formal training in strategies to effectively involve parents in the schools and teachers who have not.

12. There are no significant differences in attitude toward parent involvement in the schools among teachers of different genders.

Definition of Terms

Partial regional school district - A school district in which the grade jurisdiction is other than K-12 and is comprised of two or more towns.

Public school - Any school which depends on public finance for its operating expenses and is overseen by an elected school board.

Parent involvement - Any of a variety of activities which allow parents to participate in the educational process at home or in school.

Parent - Any individual who is the biological or legal guardian of a child enrolled in the public school.

Elementary school teacher - Any individual who is certified to instruct Kindergarten through Grade 6

Junior High Teacher - Any individual who is certified to instruct subjects taught in Grade 7 and 8, and works at one of those grade levels.

High School Teacher - Any individual who is certified to instruct subjects in Grade 9 through 12, and works at one of those grade levels.

Volunteer - Any individual who assists in some aspect of the operation of a public school without salary.

Co-learner role - Educational activities that are designed so the professional staff and parents learn together.

Attitude - A personal disposition common to individuals, but possessed to different degrees, which impels them to react to objects, situations or propositions in ways that can be called favorable or unfavorable (Guilford, 1954).

Audience role - Parents receiving information about their childrens progress or about the school.

School program supporter - Activities in which individuals lend support to the school's program and take an active part.

Advocate role - Individuals serving as an activist or spokesperson on issues regarding school policies, services for children, or community concerns related to the schools.

Decision Maker role - Those actions which involve individuals as co-equals in the educational decisions relating to public schools.

Formal education - The program of studies designed and implemented by a school system as requirements for promotion and graduation.

Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study are limited to public school teachers in one partial regional school district.

The results of this study may not be applicable to teachers employed in schools with differing characteristics than those selected for this study.

There is no assurance that the individuals who participated in this study responded honestly.

The study is descriptive in nature and subject to the limitations of descriptive research.

Outline of the Study

Chapter I includes an introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, definition of terms, and outline of the chapters of the study. Chapter II presents a review of the related literature. Chapter III describes the design and methods used for data collection. Chapter IV will reports the findings and display the data.
Chapter V summarizes the findings of the study, draws conclusions and make recommendations for further study.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher attitudes about parent involvement in the schools. The review of the literature that follows will focus on the types of research being conducted concerning parent involvement in the schools, the value of parent involvement with the schools as a means to improve the well-being and academic attainment of children, models for effective parent and school cooperation, and barriers that impede optimum parent and school cooperation.

The research indicates that the family plays a key role in the success or failure of children in school. Parental involvement in education is related to short term gains and long term academic success. Some of the more important research findings indicate a correlation between parent involvement and:

- higher grades and test scores;
- long-term academic achievement;
- positive attitudes and behavior;
- more successful programs;
- more effective schools (Lazar, 1978).

Studies pertaining to parent involvement in education vary widely in approach, methodology, and subject matter. The research tends to examine parental involvement in three areas: the parent-child relationship; the value of parent involvement into the school; and home, school, the community partnerships.

Contemporary Research on Parent Involvement With the Schools

Research studies investigating the value of involving parents with the schools have determined that children whose parents are involved or engage in educational activities are more successful in school.

Comer (1986) stated that programs to involve parents in the schools could play a major role in creating a desirable context for teaching and learning. He stressed the need for meaningful parent participation for successful schools because the sense of community, common goals, and social stability that caused public schools to be successful thirty years ago no longer exist. Due to changes in our society and its institutions, children come to school unprepared and untrusting with little agreement between home and school regarding the role of schools. He contended

that programs to involve parents in schools could play a major role in creating a desirable context for teaching and learning.

In another well documented study, Comer (1980) actively involved parents in the education of their children and with the day to day operation of two inner city schools in Connecticut. Although he noted evidence that relationships and social conditions had improved, initial indications of academic achievement was subjective and inconclusive. However, two years after the project had begun, increases in the student's test scores were statistically significant. This led Comer to conclude that increased achievement is a long term process.

He also concluded that since parents are the first and most important models and teachers of their children, the need for parent/community participation is greatest in low income and minority communities or wherever parents feel a sense of exclusion.

Other studies have also been conducted to ascertain the effectiveness of parent participation in the schools. One inquiry by Johnston and Slotnik (1985) investigated the effects of parent involvement in Salt Lake City, Utah, where it was determined that parents provided teachers with a valuable resource.

However, the results indicated that maintaining this involvement necessitated additional participation from the teachers in the personal lives of the children and parents.

Several key family behaviors related to student achievement are expectations, beliefs, attitudes, and communication patterns (Becker, 1984) . Parent education programs are effective in improving how well children use language skills, perform on tests and behave in school.

Benson, Buckley, & Medrich (1980) conducted a study to assess the relationship between specific kinds of parent-child interaction and school performance. They divided the interactions into four types: everyday interactions; cultural enrichment; parent involvement; and control over children's activity. Their results indicate that everyday interaction and control activities did not show any consequential relationship to achievement, but parent involvement activities were significantly related to achievement with all children. They also concluded that cultural activities were significant in the achievement of middle and upper socioeconomic level youngsters but were not a factor with lower socioeconomic level children.

The Child Parent Centered program operated by the Chicago School System represented another illustration of parents and schools working together in a program that resulted in significant gains in math and reading. Key elements of this program were early intervention and parent involvement. In addition to utilizing volunteers in the traditional roles of classroom aides and tutors, this design also provided educational opportunities for parents and involved them in governance activities of the schools. (Stenner & Mueller, 1973). The CPC design represents one of the earliest model that included parent participation in a governance component.

The research strongly indicates that direct parent participation in school based programs is related to student success. Whether this involvement is accomplished through daily roles in the school or by membership on school advisory councils and parent groups, it appears clearly established that direct participation makes a significant difference.

Legacies Influencing Parent and Teacher Relationships In Public Schools

Parent participation in the public education of children has gone through many changes since this country was founded on the democratic principle of

individual participation. Initially, parents were the primary educators and the family the primary place of learning (Kagan, 1984). As American society became more complex, parents abdicated the responsibility for educating their children to others in the schools. However, through in loco parentis statutes, parents maintain the right to participate in the public school system and maintain their role as the ultimate authority in forming school policy (Fantini, 1980).

In spite of democratic intentions and legal statutes, the history of parent-school relations has not proceeded peacefully (Kagan, 1984). Differences in the perceived role of the school and home have resulted in controversy and repeated demands for reform (Reese, 1978). These efforts to bring parents and schools together have left legacies for contemporary schools. Legacies -things received from an ancestor, a predecessor, or the past - have significant ramifications for current and future research. Kagan identifies separation, disequilibrium, ambiguity, and individuality as four legacies that have had significant impact on parent involvement research.

Separation results from the fact that schools and homes are different. The research is consistent in that there are distinct differences in the organization

and operation of homes when compared to the function of the public schools. These differences prompted much research surrounding strategies for bringing homes and schools closer together.

Subsequent studies focused on research to identify personal characteristics among those involved in home -school collaboration as a means to formulate strategies to improve parent involvement in the schools. One such study conducted by Stallworth (1982) investigated the attitudes of elementary school teachers and principals toward parent involvement in schools, and found that those attitudes are not obstacles to favored types of parent involvement, but do interfere with undesirable forms of involvement.

Epstein (1983) found that parents involved with teacher-leaders in parent involvement demonstrated more awareness of the teachers efforts, responded positively to more ideas from the teacher, knew more about their children's instructional program, and rate the teacher higher in interpersonal skills and overall teaching quality.

The second legacy of disequilibrium - loss or lack of balance - speaks to the alleged one way nature of the education process; the school makes the decisions and the public cooperates. Researchers claim that the

public schools are slow to accept any outside involvement, and that this has resulted in confrontations and hostile attitudes among those who want to be involved (Lightfoot, 1978; Fruchter, 1983; Comer, 1978).

McAfee (1987), determined that in spite of mounting evidence to substantiate that parental involvement is not just a way of placating parents and taxpayers, many teachers and administrators work with parents reluctantly; even grudgingly. They resent the time and effort that dealing with parents requires; they are discouraged by the lack of "acceptable" parental response; they are convinced that single parents and working mothers are not really interested in their children's school life.

Ambiguity - doubt or uncertainty concerning the role of something or someone - represents the most consequential of the legacies because it deals with the fundamental issues regarding parent involvement; why does it exist, and does it make a difference. Researchers appear to be in agreement that parent participation does make a difference, but there is much debate as to what constitutes effective involvement.

Later studies, intended to probe attitudes about the value of parent participation, discovered that the

general agreement on the importance of involving parents in the educational process tends to break down at the point of implementation (Henderson, 1988). Williams and Stallworth (1984) found that most school personnel agree that parent involvement is a vital ingredient to the child's success in school and that parents and teachers should communicate and cooperate more frequently. However, they also found that there was little, if any, agreement, pertaining to what role the parents should play.

The fourth legacy of individuality - total character peculiar to and distinguishing one person or thing from others - evolved because schools and school districts are different. This legacy has resulted in methodological problems with regard to gathering data and analyzing research results. Consequently, much of the contemporary research concerning parent participation in the schools tends to be fragmented and isolated from concurrent research.

Benefits of Parent and Teacher Cooperation On Student Performance

The literature suggests that there are many reasons to involve parents in the schools. One reason is that parent involvement benefits children (Moles, 1982; Swap, 1987). Active family involvement, where

there has been reinforcement and support for the efforts of the schools has resulted in: fewer instances of not passing into the next grade; less referrals to special education classes; and higher levels of high school completion (Bronfenbrenner, 1974).

Achievement

Achievement is the most frequently cited benefit of parent participation in education. Research indicates that parents are the first and most important teachers and although the effective schools research has identified many other variables that relate to success in schools, the parent and home variables remain the most important factors in school achievement (Mize, 1977,; Schaefer, 1971).

Numerous studies highlight the advantages to students when parents become involved with childrens' education. There is evidence to suggest that any form of participation is beneficial, but student achievement profits most from high levels of meaningful involvement. Involvement is meaningful when there is a direct benefit to children, a commitment from the school that parents are important, and a message to parents that what they, as parents, are doing is important (Sattes, 1984).

All parents communicate values to their youngsters about learning and school. These values help to shape children's perceptions of education and significantly influence the level of success they will achieve in school (Mize, 1977).

One section of the research investigates the effects on achievement when parents receive instruction or training in ways to help their children. Steans & Peterson (1973), conducted a major review of federal evaluation reports and determined that parent involvement as tutors has a positive effect on children's I.Q. scores. Although the findings on the effect of employing parents as tutors was limited at the time of the study, they concluded that involving parents does improve the performance of children; especially those in preschool.

In a similar study, Bronfenbrenner (1974) conducted research concerning the relationship between early intervention programs and long lasting I.Q. gains among culturally disadvantaged youngsters. The results indicated that there were limited long term gains for children when teachers instructed in homes with passive parent involvement. Conversely, when parents

received training and were actively involved in working with their children, studies substantiated long lasting I.Q gains.

Other research indicates that student achievement is increased when parents simply encourage learning and support their childrens' academic endeavors. In a study of students in grades 1-6, Walberg (1984) investigated what happened when parents were involved in a program to demonstrate encouragement for school activities at home with their children. Through a contract arrangement, parents agreed to: 1) provide a special place in the home for study; 2) involve the child in daily discussion; 3) oversee the child's progress in school; and 4) cooperate with the school in providing the first three properly. Those students whose parents had been involved with the program demonstrated gains on standard achievement tests twice that of similar students whose parents did not participate.

Bloom (1985) conducted a case study of talented young professionals in order to identify common characteristics of their general education, specialized training and subsequent success. He determined that there was a common strand of enthusiastic parent involvement, and that this support was demonstrated in

school lessons and competitions, but more importantly, according to Bloom, through consistent support at home for all educational ambitions.

Other factors correlated with student achievement such as student attendance, increased motivation, higher self-esteem, and a reduction in behavior problems are also influenced by parent participation in childrens' education.

Attendance

Attendance and achievement are highly correlated just as high incidents of absenteeism are related to school failure and drop-out rates. Consequently, improving attendance is one way of increasing academic achievement. The literature suggests that as parents become more involved, they feel more responsible for getting their children to school.

A research study conducted by Gilmore (1985) examined the attendance pattern of eighteen primary students who frequently did not attend school. Further investigation indicated that the parents of these students had little or no contact with the school. The need for parents to be involved in the education of their children was constantly reinforced through personal phone calls, home visits, newsletters, and

workshops. As a result, fourteen of the eighteen parents became more actively involved and absenteeism was reduced by eighty percent.

The research also demonstrates that parent involvement affects student attendance even when it is not a primary objective of the program. Phillips and Rosenberger (1983) examined one school's plan to improve student achievement. They reported that through the use of student involvement and peer counseling, increased expectations of students, business cooperation, and active involvement of parents in the school, there was a dramatic improvement in student achievement and school attendance.

Student attendance also improves when parents are informed about student absences. In a program to combat high rates of absenteeism among low achieving junior high students, parents were contacted promptly whenever a student was absent. The purposes of the communication were to determine the legitimacy of the absence as well as involve and inform the parents regarding the importance of time on task as an important predictor of academic success. As a result of this program, attendance improved significantly (Fiordaliso, R., Lordeman, A., Filipczak, J., & Friedman, R.M. (1977).

Motivation

Parent involvement also has a positive effect on students attitudes toward learning. Most studies report a significant and positive change when children begin to experience success in school. Success is an important contributor to motivation.

A review of research on the effects of parental influence on children's reading achievement by Nebor (1986) indicates that when parents assume an active and positive role in their child's education, the result is increased student motivation and improved reading progress. The study reveals that parental role modeling will improve a child's reading because the child sees reinforcement of the value of education outside of the classroom.

In a study conducted to determine the extent to which an alternative pre-school program affected parents and children's attitudes toward school, two groups of pre-schoolers were compared. One group contained children who had been involved in an educational assistance program for low income children and another group of children who attended traditional pre-school or no pre-school at all. It was reported that promoting positive attitudes on the part of

parents toward schools was also a successful way to promote positive attitudes toward school in children (Hirsch, E.S. 1986).

Student Behavior

Parent participation can also play a major role in influencing student behavior. Inappropriate behavior disrupts the learning process for everyone and can take valuable time away from academic instruction. Parents can exert control over students in areas that teachers have no access, ie., privileges, free time, money, hobbies and activities (Sattes, 1984).

Some research examines studies that concentrate on strategies to improve student behavior. Fine & Holt (1983) describe a process for school intervention of behavior problems, utilizing parent cooperation and support in a dual strategy of systemic and linear approaches to attitudinal adjustment. The parent component of the process corroborates the need for parent interaction with the school for effective behavior modification to occur.

Carter (1982) discusses reality therapy programs for improved student behavior that are being introduced into many schools. Two essential components of these programs are teacher effectiveness training and parent

effectiveness training. Parent and teacher cooperation and communication are crucial factors in the success of the programs.

Other studies indicate improved student behavior as a secondary result of parent involvement in the educational process. In a program designed to improve reading and math scores for inner city students, researchers implemented a strategy where teachers: 1) provided parents with success reports; 2) held informal parent group discussions; encouraged and facilitated opportunities for parents to contact each other; 4) sent home ideas for parents to use; 5) informed parents about cultural and educational activities in the community; 6) involved parents in after school programs with the students; and 7) organized combined parent and teacher workshops (Gross, 1974).

The results indicated significant gains in both reading and math, although many of the students continued to function below grade level. However, it was also discovered that the children demonstrated more interest in their education as well as better attendance and considerably more acceptable levels of behavior.

Self Esteem

Directly related to improved achievement is increased student self-esteem or self-concept. The literature indicates that parent participation is a crucial component of any program to improve self-worth or self-concept. The studies appear to cluster around those designed specifically to provide strategies for increasing self-esteem as well as those where improved self-esteem is a secondary result.

Bedford Stuyvesant Street Academy developed a program to improve the achievement and self-esteem of at risk high school students, based on the concept that educational success is a cooperative effort involving students, teachers, parents, and the community. The objectives were to: 1) provide students with the opportunities to share feelings about school and their environment; 2) demonstrate techniques for problem solving; 3) develop positive self-esteem based on self-control; and 4) encourage students to work together in order to increase social responsibility. (Turner, 1985).

In another study exploring reasons why children underachieve in school, Davis (1984) concluded that emotional problems, teacher troubles, peer pressure, boredom, fear of trying, and fear of growing up were

all factors. She suggested that in order to be successful, children need to have a feeling of self-worth. She further concluded that parents can initiate activities to improve children's self-esteem by getting involved with homework, maintain communication with the school, assessing the value of retention, providing rewards as opposed to bribes, and increasing expectations for their children.

Henderson (1987) conducted a study of planned parental involvement as a component of an affective education program. Fifth and sixth graders were divided into experimental and control groups in order to determine the effects of parent participation on alternative thinking and reading achievement. The results indicated a positive correlation between parent participation and alternative thinking. The students also showed significant gains in a self-esteem as a result of the parental participation.

In conclusion, the literature seems to clearly indicate that any kind of parent involvement influences student achievement, but the gains are most significant when the involvement is meaningful and long lasting. Parent involvement positively influences behavior, self-esteem, motivation, and attendance. Given these facts, it seems logical that parent

participation would be an integral part of childrens' education. However, further research was needed to identify what roles teachers at various grade levels should have in getting parents involved.

Types of Parent Involvement in the Schools

The literature contains numerous typologies and models of successful practices for involving parents and the community in the operation of the schools. These models provide examples of effective strategies that could be consulted or replicated.

Good (1973) defines a typology as a systematic classification of certain modes of behavior. Parent participation typologies provide a conceptual outline of the essential elements of successful parent involvement programs.

Davies (1985) constructed a typology which included four components of parent and citizen participation in education. The four categories are co-production (partnership), decision making, citizen advocacy, and parent choice. He constructed this typology to encompass: 1) the power parents should have about school policies and practices, 2) the power citizens should have about school policies and practices, 3) the ways in which these powers should be exercised, 4) ways parents and citizens can address

their grievances and concerns about the schools 5) the choice parents should have about what kinds of schools their children will attend and 6) ways public schools can achieve legitimacy in the eyes of the parents.

Epstein (1988) developed a five element typology based on three goals: improving school programs; improving student learning; and improving parents' awareness of their responsibilities. The five components of Epstein's typology include: 1) the basic obligations of parents - the responsibilities of families to ensure children's health and safety; 2) the basic obligations of schools - the communications from school to home about school programs and children's progress; 3) parent involvement at school - volunteers who assist in the school, or come to school to support programs; 4) parent involvement in learning activities at home - parent or child initiated activities or instructions from teachers intended to assist children at home on learning activities; and 5) parent involvement in governance and advocacy - parents' taking decision making or advocacy roles at the school, district or state level.

Good (1973) characterizes a model as a pattern of something to be reproduced; a set of interrelated variables which together comprise elements that are

symbolic of a social system. Kagan (1984) described models as ways to describe and predict the change process. Some classified specific activities according to the design of the planner while others described stages or levels of participation.

Many conceptual models for parent involvement see participation as a hierarchical system with decision making, or governance, at the top. Once inside this participatory system, parents can choose for themselves how they wish to participate. Decision making is listed in many as the most desired state, due to a goal of developing parents power over school decisions (Heleen, 1988).

Arnstein (1979) constructed a model known as The Ladder of Participation. This hierarchical model identified three levels of involvement starting with non-participation, advancing to tokenism, and ultimately arriving at the desired state of citizen power at the top of the ladder.

Similar models were constructed by Winters & Schraft as well as Fantini. According to Fantini (1980), direct community participation can take several forms; each having different effects on student achievement and other measures of educational impact. Participation can be directed at either instruction or

school governance, or both. The involved citizen may be found in the role of client of the school, may serve the school as a resource, may use the school as a consumer, or may become a decision-maker at some level.

Winters & Schraft presented their model as a pyramid, with the lowest or bottom section representing what they called entry level activities including participation at conferences, support for school activities, and communication with teachers. The second level represented day to day activities as school volunteers, along with other active support roles in the school on a regular basis. The third level involved school governance activities such as membership on school advisory councils, or leadership in the P.T.A. or P.T.O. (Kagan & Schraft, 1981).

Comer developed two models for involving parents in the schools. In the earlier design (Comer, 1980), he identified three distinct levels of participation. Level one strategies included activities designed to make the school a supportive place for staff members, parents, and students. Level two included the selection of parents and teachers to be involved on a management team that was responsible for developing and implementing a building master plan, and the third

level entailed cultivating a sense of acceptance and belonging by all those associated with the school community.

In 1987, Comer created a process model in which administrators, parents, teachers, and support staff work together utilizing three mechanisms: a governance or management group, a mental health or support staff group, and a parents group.

> The goal of the process model is to create a social climate that helps to close the student development gap, to create an academic program based on achievement data, and to carry out a staff development program based on social and academic goals established at the building level.

Since children do not get their entire education at school, parent and community involvement are crucial to the education process. Van Devender contends that some needs must be met by the school while others are the responsibility of the parents. Her model involves a three step approach, involving parent motivation of students, parent participation in school functions, and parent - teacher communication as a strategy to generate positive relationships and foster interaction among all segments of the educational community.

Due to what they see as a problem of applying early childhood strategies inappropriately to parents of older children, Gotts & Purnell (1987), developed a model including separate variables for elementary and secondary involvement. They determined that parent involvement in the schools appears to be greatest at the pre-school level, remain high during the primary years, and quickly drops thereafter. Based on the theory that effective home-school relations result when plans for action are based on the particular circumstances of the parents, their model of School and Family Relations Involvement considers parent group involvement, monitoring of school progress, teacher contact, academic focus, attendance focus, conduct and discipline, and school events.

The literature demonstrates that parent participation models furnish illustrations of successful programs that can be referred to or replicated. They can also provide assistance in establishing priorities, defining goals, and organizing the details for desired outcomes. However, further research appeared to be necessary concerning how teachers view parent involvement in these roles, and if they feel that the involvement should change according to the grade level of the students.

Barriers To Parent Involvement With the Schools

The concept of parents assisting in their children's education by working with schools has been the subject of ongoing debate. Even though parents and teachers appear to recognize the value of parent participation, there are serious barriers to its implementation.

A national poll conducted by the N.E.A. determined that 90% of teachers at all grade levels felt that more home-school cooperation would be beneficial (Moles, 1982). A 1978 Gallop poll indicated that 80% of the parents of school age children were willing to become involved with evening programs to learn how work more closely with the schools. However, in a 1981 survey conducted in six states, it was determined that most parents and teachers did not collaborate in school related areas (Swap, 1987).

A barrier is any situation, concrete or abstract that hinders parents from becoming involved with the education of their children. The most common concrete barriers to parent involvement include transportation, babysitting, and work schedule conflicts. The primary

abstract barrier to improved parent involvement seems to be the attitude of both parents and school personnel (Williams & Lizotte, 1985).

Moles (1982) identified a variety of conditions that interfere with home-school communication and cooperation with the schools. He contends that many parents and teachers face competing demands of work and family life, parents from different cultural backgrounds feel mistrust and anxiety when dealing with school staff, and teachers who lack training for dealing with parents have difficulty relating to culturally different families.

Lightfoot (1978) suggests that home-school relations are inherently in conflict. She believes that different priorities and perceptions of families and schools such as concern for one's own child versus responsibility for group progress will inevitably create conflict over the means of attaining common goals. She sees collaboration largely as a one way process with schools seldom accommodating in a significant way to family needs.

In families, the interactions are functionally diffuse in the sense that the participants are deeply connected, and their duties are all-encompassing. In schools, the interactions are functionally specific

because the relationships are more defined by the technical competence and individual status of the participants. Children in the family are treated as special persons, but pupils in school are treated as members of categories. She declares:

> there are very few opportunities for parents and teachers to come together for meaningful, substantive discussion. In fact, schools organize public, ritualistic occasions that do not allow for real contact, negotiation, or criticism between parents and teachers. Rather, they are institutionalized ways of establishing boundaries between insiders (teachers) and interlopers (parents) under the guise of polite conversation and mature cooperation. Parent-Teacher Association meetings and open house rituals at the beginning of the school year are contrived occasions that symbolically affirm the idealized parent-school relationship but rarely provide the chance for authentic interaction (1978, pp 27-28).

Tanghi and Leach (1982) conducted a study of junior high students and identified barriers affecting parents and teachers of older students. Teachers reported competing home responsibilities, fears for

their own safety at evening meetings, the perception that parents do not transmit educational values, feeling overwhelmed by the problems of their students and families, and low expectations regarding parents' follow-up efforts. Parents identified family health problems, work schedules, having small children, receiving only bad news from school, fears for their safety, late notice of meetings, and difficulty understanding their children's' homework.

The research suggests a number of factors that influence parents ability or desire to be involved with their children's education. These elements include demographic changes in the school population, attitudes and perceptions of parents and the school, school practices, pre-service and inservice teacher training, availability, and communication.

Demographic Trends

Demographic trends influencing parent and school involvement include an increase in: the number of at-risk children; single parent families; families whose native language is not English; and the number of older upper-middle class who are having children. The 1987 Metropolitan Life Survey (Harris) indicates that the families who send children to school today are very different from the parents who sent children to school

a generation ago. Living with one parent has become the norm for many of today's children. Overall, 26 percent of families in the U.S. are single parent families. This includes: more than 50 percent of all black children; 25 percent of all Hispanic children; and 16 percent of all white children.

Availability

Another barrier which affects parents and teachers availability to meet is schedule conflicts. Nine out of ten teachers indicate that the most appropriate time for meetings and conferences is in the afternoon, but at least a third of the parents indicated that this time was impossible for them due to work commitments. There appears to be a reluctance on the part of teachers to re-arrange their schedules to accommodate working parents who are unable to adjust their schedule (Amundson, 1988).

In Drawing in the Family, a report published by the Education Commission of the States (1988) it was determined that parents find it difficult to participate in the schools as fully as they would like because of work related obstacles that include parents working hours which often leave no time to participate as volunteers or attend school events. This is complicated by employers who often do not allow parents

to take time off for school related activities without losing pay. Parents with small children sometimes have a difficult time finding day care in order to free them to visit the schools. Some parents also lack transportation to get to the school (Moles, 1987).

Many families simply cannot invest the time and energy necessary for involvement in school improvement. Parents are too consumed by the demands of work and caring for their families needs to manage the time and energy for sustained involvement (Fruchter, 1984).

Communication

The real barriers of communication are not technical but personal. People communicate most readily with individuals who they like and trust. Real communication occurs only when people pause to listen to each other in an attempt to understand what is being said. This necessitates withholding the tendency to judge and prematurely evaluate comments made by other people. Both teachers and parents appear to recognize that most communication between them is negative (Harris, 1987). They also agree that some of the school work is beyond the comprehension of some parents, despite their desire to understand.

Teachers incorrectly perceive that they are effectively communicating with parents, even though parents do not share the same feelings. According to Epstein (1987), one third of all parents receive no communication from the school during the course of the school year. Other parents expressed frustration in that the only communication they receive is when something goes wrong. They feel unwanted by schools - except when they're needed to control the children (Comer, 1988).

Language is another obstacle to communication. The specialized vocabulary of educators may not be understandable to non-educators. Teachers must be aware of the different social backgrounds within a community as well as the multiple definitions of words that cause inaccuracies in communication (Brouillet, 1986). Also, many parents who speak a language other than English are unable to communicate with the schools (Linder, 1988). According to Harris, (1987)

> It is not surprising to see a pattern of declining contact between parents and teacher as the child progresses from lower grade levels to higher grade levels. However, it is surprising that hand in hand with this pattern goes rising dissatisfaction over the frequency of contact. This dissatisfaction,

> while never reaching large proportions, clearly rises on the part of parents as well as teachers between the elementary grades and the high school level. A second pattern exists that seems to distinguish better off vs. worse school districts. Teachers who work in wealthier districts and parents who themselves have college training seem to have more contact with one another and to report themselves as more satisfied (p. 36).

Attitudes and Perceptions

Misconceptions on the part of parents and school personnel hinder chances of developing a collegial relationship, thereby limiting parent involvement as a means of helping to improve schools and education. Some parents do not clearly understand how to work with the school to help their child achieve. Others do not realize the significance of parent involvement in their child's ultimate academic success (McAfee, 1987).

The research indicates that parents and teachers have very different perceptions of the other's availability and receptiveness to communications. The Metropolitan Life Survey (Harris, 1987) concluded that a majority of American teachers (55%) felt uneasy or reluctant about approaching parents to talk with them

about their children. In contrast, only about 20 percent of the parents polled expressed significant apprehension about contacting teachers. It was further determined that majority of the 20 percent were parents with income under $15,000.

Parents with low incomes or little education often feel that they are not qualified to talk with teachers. Poor school experiences of their own may make them uncomfortable visiting the school or talking with teachers (Linder, 1988).

Moles (1987) suggests that there are also psychological barriers that stifle parent and school interaction. He reports that single and married parents have the same interest and willingness to help children with home learning activities. Single parents spend even more time helping their children at home. Some teachers make the same demands on single and married parents and rate them both equally helpful and responsible for home learning activities, while others make more demands on single parents but rate them less helpful and responsible.

Despite mounting evidence that parent involvement is not just a way of placating parents and taxpayers, many teachers and administrators work with parents reluctantly, even grudgingly. They resent the time and

effort that working with parents requires; they are discouraged by the lack of parental response; and they are convinced that all those single parents and working mothers are not really interested in their children's' school life (McAfee, 1987).

School Practices

A number of school practices also discourage parent participation. According to a 1985 study conducted by the National PTA, many schools provide only limited opportunities for parents to participate, and those opportunities often revolve around traditional roles such as homework helper, fundraiser, audience for school programs, and room mothers. Even though many parents are willing and interested in becoming more involved in advocacy and advisory roles, the schools continue to resist this opportunity.

Stallworth (1982) determined that even though principals strongly agree with the proposition that parents who have had experience with assisting in the classroom tend to become more involved in their children's learning, they felt that appropriate involvement roles for parents should include making sure children do their homework, attending school activities, serving as home tutors, and becoming active supporters of the school program. They opposed any

suggestion that parents should evaluate teachers, principals, and program. They saw parents as least useful in making teacher assignments, hiring and firing staff, evaluating teacher performance, selecting teaching methods, and determining school budget priorities.

According to Chavkin & Williams (1987), when administrators hold narrow views about parent involvement, they place limits on the ways parents can participate in the education of their children. Further, they may consider parents unresponsive or apathetic regarding their children's education when they fail to become involved in the limited ways offered them. Parents who have limited contact with school personnel seldom become more involved as they view school personnel as being insensitive to the concerns of the parents and the community .

Other school related obstacles include notices of meetings and events which sometimes come too late for parents to make the arrangements necessary to attend. Also, mismatches in teacher and parent schedules often make it impossible for conferences. One third of public school parents say they would prefer to meet in the evenings, but only 9% of teachers say that would be convenient for them. Some parents also feel that the

schools are insensitive to the problem of broken homes and give assignments presuming both parents are available in the home or plan social events requiring a particular parent (Linder, 1988).

Communication Tips and Techniques (National School Public Relations Association, 1987) states that in this age of teacher-parent team efforts and community involvement, some schools still seem bent on isolating themselves and paving the way for their own destruction through counterproductive practices like locking doors at the close of school, insulating teachers and administrators from parents except during normal hours, posting offensive signs on doors and corridor walls reminding outsiders that they must report to the office, using big words during parent conferences in order to make it perfectly clear that the professionals are infinitely more intelligent than the parents are.

Pre-Training and Inservice

Teachers and administrators do not have education and training in how to work effectively with parents and the community. Educators responded to postwar conditions by raising credential standards and improving course content and teaching methods, but they paid little attention to the affective context of education, to the quality of relationships among

teachers, staff, students, and the community. This skew developed and still exists today because learning was and still is thought of as an isolated, almost mechanical, cognitive operation that students can engage in or reject at will (Comer, 1987).

Much in-service is focused on classroom instruction on the latest idea making the rounds such as stress management or a particular discipline technique. Working with a parent does not have the immediate appeal of something more directly related to school personnel's responsibilities, even though the long-term pay-off may be greater for all concerned (McAfee, 1987).

Most teachers and administrators who work well with students and promote their development do so on the basis of intuitive knowledge and skills, not through knowledge that they gained in applied child development courses in their pre-service or in-service training. There aren't many such courses. (Comer, 1988).

In summary, the literature identifies policies and procedures, attitudes, availability, training and communication as barriers to effective parent participation.

The research also indicates that further analysis of these obstacles and their effect on specific parent and teacher behaviors is a crucial component of any plan to improve parent involvement in education. However, there appears to be limited consideration given to how the attitudes of teachers affect their willingness to overcome barriers inhibiting more effective parent involvement in the schools.

Teachers Attitudes Toward Parent Involvement

Even though the research appears to be limited, several studies have focused on teachers views toward parent involvement. The results indicate that most teachers prefer to have parents involved in what are referred to as traditional roles. The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (Stallworth & Williams, 1982) conducted an extensive study in six (6) states over a four year period. The study concluded that elementary school teachers and administrators had a positive attitude toward the value of parent involvement. Parents were seen as cooperative, concerned, and competent partners in the educational process. However, educators expressed a clear preference for parent involvement in what they called traditional roles, i.e., attending meetings, being an audience, supporting the teacher at home, etc. The study clearly indicated that teachers and

administrators were both negative toward more active parent involvement in areas including advocacy and decision making.

Epstein and Becker (1982) examined similar issues concerning teacher attitudes toward parent involvement. She concluded that teachers supported patterns of interaction with parents that including talking with parents, meeting parents at open house, and sending information home. However, very few teachers engaged in activities beyond these standard roles. She also indicated that although 75% of the teachers in the study agreed that parent involvement was a good idea, nearly half were skeptical about the possibilities of involving parents in learning activities at home.

Langenbrunner and Thornburg (1980) investigated the types and levels of parent involvement desired by teachers, parents and administrators involved with pre-schoolers. The study included two (2) questionnaires. One measured the amount of actual parent involvement in the schools, and the other examined the desired level of involvement the subjects felt that there should be. The results indicated that parents, teachers, and administrators all preferred the most involvement at the supporter level. These roles included parents receiving information from the school,

attending plays and meetings at the school, reading and returning pupil performance reports, and staying informed of school activities by reading school bulletins.

Even though the majority of research has focused on elementary school, recent studies are investigating the attitudes of a wider segment of the educational community. The Metropolitan Life Survey of American Teachers (Harris, 1987) sought the opinions of parents and teachers from all grade levels on how they view each others role in the education of children as well as ways to strengthen home-school links. The study revealed that: 53% of the teachers felt that parents failed to motivate their children so that they want to learn in school; 62% felt that parents left their children alone too much after school; and 50% of the teachers surveyed felt that most parents neglect to see that their children's homework gets done.

The findings also indicate that 55% of all parents surveyed (including 63% of the parents of high school aged students) felt that their school only contacts them when something goes wrong. Another 22% of the parents surveyed felt that they were not given the opportunity for meaningful roles in the school..

The study concludes that there is a need for schools to seek new ways to work with parents to bring about change. Recommendations include encouraging working parents to participate in their children's education as well as increasing opportunities for parents to participate in educational programs about their role in the schools.

In a recent study, Epstein and Dauber (1989) probed the attitudes of inner city elementary and middle schools teachers in order to analyze strengths and weaknesses of parent involvement programs. They concluded that elementary school programs of parent involvement are stronger and more comprehensive than those in the middle schools. They also concluded that classroom organizations (e.g., self-contained, semi-departmental, team, etc.) influence teachers practices of contacting parents.

This study also suggests that teachers may be creating false and exaggerated discrepancies about themselves, their colleagues, and parents' interest in parental involvement in the schools. "Teachers' beliefs about other teachers and teacher and parent beliefs about each other often are inaccurate until they are assessed, shared, and compared" (Epstein and Dauber, 1989 pg. 15).

The findings point to the critical need for school personnel to be trained in effective practices for parent involvement. The study also suggests that this cannot take place until teachers begin to examine their own views and those of their colleagues toward parent involvement in the schools.

Summary

The literature concerning parent involvement in the schools is consistent. Meaningful parent participation results in improved student achievement and related gains in self-esteem, motivation, attendance, and behavior. Consequently, the schools need to implement effective strategies to develop links between the home and the school.

However, the research also indicates that there are serious barriers impeding these efforts to increase parent participation. Some affect parents in home learning or support roles, and could result from lack of resources, availability, or skills. Other barriers inhibit parental involvement in decision making and governance roles in the schools. These obstacles appear to evolve from conflict between the home and school concerning policies and procedures as well as the attitudes of parents and school personnel.

Although there does not appear to be extensive research examining how teachers' attitudes influence their behavior with parents, some studies have suggested that there is relationship. Chavkins and Williams (1985) concluded that the attitudes of teachers and other educators are critical to the development of effective parent involvement programs and activities. Teachers who had positive attitudes toward parent involvement were more apt to participate in workshops and activities with parents as well as involve them more in the educational process (Becker and Epstein, 1982).

Since there is evidence to suggest that attitudes might influence teachers' willingness to involve parents in the school, and because studies examining the attitudes of teachers at various levels appears to be limited, additional research was needed. An investigation of elementary, junior high, and high school teacher attitudes could provide valuable information for designing more effective parent involvement programs at all grade levels.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Methods

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher attitudes toward parent involvement in the schools. This chapter discusses the methods by which the sample was selected and the techniques that were used to collect and analyze the data.

The Research Problem Restated

Studies examining teachers' attitudes appear to have been limited to certain teachers, administrators and other school officials. Since the literature does not appear to contain any conclusive evidence to suggest that teachers at all levels maintain similar views, it appeared that research examining the attitudes of teachers at elementary, junior and senior high could add to the body of knowledge regarding teachers' attitudes toward parent involvement in the schools.

The study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What are the attitudes of teachers in a partial regional school district regarding the value of parent involvement in the schools;

2. What roles do teachers in a partial regional school district think that parents should play in the schools;
3. In what decisions do teachers in a partial regional school district think parents should have input;
4. How are these feelings regarding parent involvement alike and/or different among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers;
5. Do any of the following factors influence teacher attitudes concerning parent involvement:
   A - professional training;
   B - years of service;
   C - teacher age;
   D - family status;
   E - gender;
6. What implications may be drawn from this study that might improve parent involvement programs?

Population and Sample

Elementary, Junior high, and high school teachers employed in the Silver Lake Partial Regional School District were the subjects of this study. This district was selected because it provides a population

with a wide range of demographic characteristics within the frame work of one school system under a single superintendent.

Silver Lake is a K-12 school district located in southeastern Massachusetts, composed of the four towns of Pembroke, Halifax, Plympton, and Kingston. The regional agreement between the towns allows each community to maintain independent control of its elementary schools under a locally elected school board. The junior high and two high school are regionalized under a separate school committee. The members of the regional committee are elected or appointed, based on the population of the member community. Decisions affecting all four towns, K-12, are decided by a Union Committee, composed of appointed members from the other school committees.

Procedure for Sample Selection

There are currently four hundred and eighteen teachers (418) employed by the Silver Lake Regional School District and the member communities. For the purpose of this study, two hundred and fifty (250) teachers were surveyed. Participants were selected through a stratified random sample in order to insure that the number of responses is proportionate to the ratio of teachers at particular grade levels.

A cover letter and survey were distributed to each teacher selected in order to: 1) explain the purpose of the study; and 2) request that the individual complete and returning the questionnaire. The study was designed so that participants were able to remain anonymous. Therefore the instrument was a blind survey, not coded in any way. After two weeks, a follow-up reminder was sent, for posting, to participating schools requesting that individuals who have not yet returned the questionnaires do so.

Instrumentation

The criteria for selecting an instrument to measure teachers' attitudes concerning parent involvement in the schools was established after a thorough review of the relevant literature, consideration of the research questions for this study, and discussion with other teachers and parents. It was determined that the instrument should:

1. evaluate teachers attitudes toward multiple aspects of parent involvement including, but not limited to, parents and teacher relationships, parents role in the school setting, parents working with children, parents as decision makers, parents as advocates, and parents as partners in the schools;

2. be appropriate for use with the targeted sample of elementary, junior high, and high school teachers;
3. not be overly time consuming for the respondent;
4. yield valid and reliable information.

In order to identify published instruments that met the established criteria, this researcher examined Buros Ninth Mental Measurement Yearbook (1985), Index to Tests Used In Educational Dissertations (1988), Eric, Psychological Abstracts, and Dissertation Abstracts. Recognized experts in the field of parent involvement in the schools were also contacted for recommendations.

Although Buros, The Index to Tests Used in Educational Dissertations, and Psychological Abstracts all provided numerous instruments to measure teachers attitudes, none were found which examined teachers attitudes toward parent involvement. Dissertation Abstracts and ERIC did yield several instruments which were rejected after further investigation because of limited focus, questionnaire length, or inaccessibility for examination.

The instruments for this study were developed by this researcher utilizing three sources: (1) a review

of pertinent literature concerning survey construction; (2) examination of other instruments that measured certain aspects of teachers' attitudes toward parent involvement; and (3) discussions with parents, teachers, administrators, and other educational leaders about parent involvement.

Scales, Measurement, and Instrument Reliability

The teacher response form was divided into two parts. Part one consists of demographic information about the teacher. The information requested included: age, grade level, gender, marital status, educational background, years at present grade level, and years of total teaching experience. There was also a question pertaining to specialized training in parent involvement.

Part two included fifty statements that were designed to elicit responses regarding teacher attitudes toward (1) parent and teacher relationships, (2) parents as an audience in the schools (3) parents involvement as school supporters, (4) parents as decision makers, (5) parents as advocates, (6) parents as problem solvers, and (7) parents as tutors.

Responses were recorded by circling one of five answers on a Likert type scale including SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, N - No Strong Opinion, D - Disagree,

and SD - Strongly Disagree. Questions were constructed so that some supported parent involvement while others opposed parental roles in the school. Scoring of the positive questions involved assigning a value of (1) to strongly agree, a value of (2) to agree, a value of (3) to No Opinion, a value of (4) to disagree, and a value of (5) to strongly disagree. Scoring of the negative questions involved assigning a value of (5) to strongly agree, a value of (4) to agree, a value of (3) to no strong opinion, a value of (2) to disagree, and a value of (1) to strongly disagree. This reversal of scoring allowed for pro-involvement as well as anti-involvement responses to be reflected in data tabulation and analysis.

The instrument was validated by volunteer parents, teachers, and administrators representing all grade levels, as well as other individuals recognized as being knowledgeable in the area of parent involvement in the schools. These individuals were asked to critique the instrument for clarity, overall appearance, and thoroughness. After reviewing the recommendations of these evaluators, modifications were made to the instrument and it was re-distributed to the same individuals for additional comments.

Once it appeared that the instrument was valid, the test-retest method was used to estimate the stability, reliability, and consistency of the instrument. The instrument was administered to six elementary, six junior high, and six high school teachers. After a two week interval, the instrument was re-administered and Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was applied to the responses to determine if the instrument would be reliable. The resulting score of .93 indicated that the instrument was suitable for this study.

Analysis of the Data

The purpose of the instruments was to measure teacher attitudes toward parent involvement. The following twelve (12) hypotheses were developed to examine these data.

1. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers regarding parent and teacher relationships in the school;

2. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as decision makers in the school;

3. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as supporters in the school;

4. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as advocates for children;

5. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents assisting students with school work;

6. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as an audience in the schools;

7. There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as learners in the school;

8. There are no significant differences in attitude among teachers with different levels of professional training toward parent involvement in the school;

9. There are no significant differences in attitude among different age teachers toward parent involvement in the schools;

10. There are no significant differences in attitude among teachers who are and are not parents concerning parent involvement in the schools;

11. There are no significant difference in attitude toward parent involvement between teachers who have received formal training in strategies to effectively involve parents in the schools and teachers who have not.

12. There are no significant differences in attitude toward parent involvement in the schools among teachers of different genders.

The treatment of the data included preparation of descriptive and inferential statistics in order to examine teacher attitudes toward parent involvement in the schools. The data was key punched into a computer for easy access and more effective analysis.

Descriptive analysis involved frequency and percentage distribution of responses as well as the

tabulation of means and standard deviations. These data were displayed on tables, charts, and graphs for comparison among target groups.

Inferential analysis was accomplished through an ANOVA (analysis of the variance) and determination of the F ratio. ANOVA was selected instead of a "t" test because it allowed this researcher to compare differences among many sample groups simultaneously. Although comparisons among more than two (2) groups could be accomplished by successive "t" tests, research indicates that "the alpha error, the probability of being wrong when the null hypothesis is rejected, inflates as the number of decisions to reject increases (Sprinthall, 1987, pg 249)."

In the event that the F ratio was found to be significant among groups, Scheffe's Post Hoc Analysis was applied in order to examine where the differences occurred.

Threat to Internal Validity

Two possible threats to internal validity were this researchers potential familiarity with teachers who responded to the questionnaire and the design of the instrumentation. However it was concluded that due to the size of the target system, and the fact that teachers tend to work in isolation, this researcher

does not know the majority of the staff and has a limited relationship with others. Furthermore, the responses were anonymous, thereby neutralizing any influence that personal contact might have posed.

The second threat concerning instrumentation was addressed through meaningful data collection strategies that included: (1) piloting of the questionnaire in order to determine its stability, reliability, and consistency, (2) declaration of the limitations of the study and (3) careful selection of the specific population and sample.

Threats to External Validity

Potential external threats to validity might have included discussion of the instrument among groups of teachers as well as the temptation to respond to certain questions according to what is socially desirable instead of how the individual truly feels. Participants could have responded differently because they knew that they were participating in a study.

Although there is little that could have been done to prevent teachers from discussing the questionnaire, most teachers have established opinions on educational matters that would not be changed through casual conversation. Furthermore, because teachers tend to be involved frequently with responding to questionnaires,

this researcher was confident that they would respond sincerely, and without consultation with colleagues. The assurance of anonymity for the participants also enabled participants to respond without fear of reprisal.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of selected public school teachers toward parent involvement in the schools. This chapter presents the descriptive, comparative, and correlational analysis of the data examined through this study.

Description of the Study

This study required a sample of public school teachers employed in a partial regional school district. Candidates for participation were chosen from six elementary schools, one junior high school, and two high schools utilizing a stratified random sample formula.

Surveys were distributed to 250 teachers during the second week of October, 1990. 209 teachers responded to the survey and returned the material. 205 teachers provided complete surveys while 4 were eliminated due to incomplete data. No identification of individuals who completed the survey was requested for this study in an effort to maximize the percentage of teachers who would participate. Since this was a

blind study, it was not possible to contact those individuals who did not return the packet. The return rate for the study was eighty two percent (82%).

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was selected for the statistical analysis. Means and correlation coefficients were rounded to two decimal places, according to standard convention (Springthal, 1984), in order to facilitate presentation of the data.

Descriptive and inferential statistics were prepared. Descriptive statistics included the calculation of frequency and percentage distribution of responses as well as the tabulation of means and standard deviations. Inferential statistics were generated through the use of Chi-Square, T-Tests, and Analysis of the Variance (ANOVA). Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to measure the strength of relationships and Scheffe's Post Hoc Analysis was utilized to determine where true differences occurred among groups.

Demographic Data

Gender

Of the 205 teachers who responded to the survey, 135 were female and 70 were male. By groups there

were: at the elementary level, 71 female and 17 male participants; at the junior high level, 22 female and 23 male participants; and at the high school level, 42 female and 30 male participants (Table 1)

Table 1

Gender by Grade Level

Grade Level	Elementary	Junior High	High School	Total
Gender				
Female	71	22	42	135 (66%)
Male	17	23	30	70 (34%)
Total	88 (43%)	45 (22%)	72 (35%)	205

Age

The participants indicated their age group by selecting one of four categories. Twenty one were between 21 and 30 years old, 66 were between 31 and 40, 88 were between 41 and 50, and 30 were over the age of 55 (Table 2).

Table 2

Gender by Age Group

Age Group	21 - 30	31 - 40	41 - 50	51 and over
Gender				
Female	17	47	56	15
Male	4	19	32	15
Total	21 (10%)	66 (32%)	88 (43%)	30 (15%)

Experience

Teachers responded to the experience question by reporting the exact number of years that they have taught. These data were analyzed and divided into four approximately equivalent groups for further analysis. The groups were coded as Low, Group 2, Group 3, and High. The breakdown was: Low, 1 - 11 years of experience; Group 2, 12 - 16 years of experience; Group 3, 17 - 20 years of experience; High, 21 and over (Table 3).

Table 3

Years of Teaching Experience

Experience	Category	Frequency	Percent
1 to 11	Low	53	25%
12 to 16	Group 2	49	24%
17 to 20	Group 3	40	31%
21 and over	High	63	31%

Levels of Formal Education

Participants were asked to indicate their highest level of professional training achieved. The data indicated that the teachers who participated in this study had earned the following degrees: 71 (35%) had completed Bachelor Degrees; 23 (11%) had earned thirty credits beyond the Bachelor Degree; 62 (30%) had finished a Master Degree; thirty three (16%) of the teachers had completed thirty hours of study beyond the Master Degree; 15 teachers (11%) possessed Certificates of Advanced Graduate Study; and 1 teacher (.05%) had earned a Doctorate degree.

For the purpose of this study, the individual teacher at the Doctorate level was pooled with the 15

at the CAGS level. The levels of education data were also analyzed by grade level in order to identify possible significant correlations (Table 4).

Table 4

Levels of Educational Training by Grade Level

Grade Level	Elementary	Junior High	High School	Total
Degree				
Bachelor	39	11	21	71
Bachelor +30	13	2	8	23
Master	18	15	29	62
Master +30	11	13	9	33
CAGS	6	4	5	15
Doctorate	1			
Total	88 (43%)	45 (22%)	72 (35%)	

Data describing the highest level of professional training achieved were also arranged according to the four age categories in order to investigate any possible significant relationships (Table 5).

Table 5

Levels of Educational Training by Age

Age Group	21-30	31-40	41-50	51 +	Total
Degree					
Bachelor	14	26	23	8	71 (35%)
Bachelor +30	-	11	8	4	23 (11%)
Master	6	20	30	6	62 (30%)
Master +30	1	6	19	7	33 (16%)
CAGS	-	2	8	5	15 (7%)
Doctorate	-	1	-	-	1
Total	21 (10%)	66 (32%)	88 (43%)	30 (15%)	

Analysis of the Data

Twelve hypotheses were investigated in this study. Single factor analysis of the variance (ANOVA) were calculated for Hypotheses 1 through 9 in order to determine significant differences in attitudes among the three groups. Scheffe's Post Hoc Analysis, the most rigorous instrument available (Winter, 1981), was selected for use with the ANOVA in order to locate where true differences occurred.

Hypotheses 10 through 12 were analyzed using two tailed t-tests. T-tests were selected because two

groups were being compared in each hypothesis. Tests to determine significance were conducted at the .05 level of probability.

Chi-Square calculations were also computed for each hypothesis in order to determine if there were relationships between independent and dependent variables. The Pearson r correlation was also tabulated for each hypothesis in order to ascertain the strength of relationships. An alpha of .05 was used as the significant criterion for correlations.

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers regarding parent and teacher relationships in the school.

The data relating to the investigation of Hypothesis 1 are presented in Tables 6 and 7. The data indicate that there are significant differences among the teachers at particular levels regarding parent and teacher relationships. The Scheffe's Post Hoc Analysis indicated that the responses of elementary school teachers were significantly different from those of the junior high and high school teachers. Elementary teachers were more positive toward parent and teacher relationships. Hypothesis 1 was rejected.

Elementary school teachers held the most positive attitudes toward parent and teacher relationship questions. Eighty two percent (82%) felt that parents were cooperative with teachers in solving problems that students experience during the school year. Seventy three percent (73%) of junior high teachers and seventy five percent (75%) of senior high teachers also indicated that parents cooperated with the schools.i

However, forty three percent (43%) of the elementary staff participants also reported that teachers appeared to be uncomfortable communicating with parents. By comparison, thirty one percent (31%) of the junior high teachers and thirty three percent (33%) of the high school teachers indicated that teachers were uneasy discussing school issues with parents.

Fifty six percent (56%) of the elementary school personnel responded that teacher participation in parent involvement activities would increase if there was a parent involvement coordinator in the building. Forty nine percent (49%) of the high school teachers and forty percent (40%) of the junior high teachers thought a parent coordinator in the building would improve teachers' enthusiasm for parent participation.

Table 6

Group Data on Parent Teacher Relationships

Grade Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Elementary	3.26	.33	88
Junior High	2.97	.30	45
High School	3.11	.32	72
Total	3.15	.34	205

Table 7

Parent Teacher Relationships: Analysis of the Variance

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	2	2.75	1.37	13.2240
Within Groups	202	20.99	.10	
Total	204	23.73		

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as decision makers in the school.

The data pertaining to Hypothesis 2 are presented in Tables 8 and 9. The results indicated that there was no significant difference in attitude among the three groups. All three groups strongly opposed parent involvement in decision making roles. Hypothesis 2 was accepted.

Table 8

Group Data on Decision Making Questions

Grade Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Elementary	2.57	.71	88
Junior High	2.32	.65	45
High School	2.63	.68	72
Total	2.54	.69	205

Table 9

Decision Making Questions: Analysis of the Variance

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	2	2.81	1.41	2.9869
Within Groups	202	95.17	.47	
Total	204	97.99		

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as supporters of the school.

The data relevant to Hypothesis 3 are presented in Tables 10 and 11. Item analysis of the specific questions related to this hypothesis revealed that there was a difference in attitude. The Scheffe' Post Hoc Analysis revealed that the responses of the elementary school teachers were significantly different from the junior high and high school teachers regarding parents as supporters of the schools. The elementary teachers were the most positive toward parents as supporters for the schools. Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Table 10

Group Data on Teachers' Attitudes Towards Parents as School Supporters

Grade Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Elementary	3.52	.33	88
Junior High	3.12	.40	45
High School	3.28	.33	72
Total	3.35	.38	205

Table 11

Teachers' Attitudes Toward Parents as School Supporters: Analysis of the Variance

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	2	5.10	2.55	21.2075
Within Groups	202	24.31	.12	
Total	204	29.41		

Questions in this section of the survey examined the role of parents as fund raisers, volunteers in the schools, and chaperones for field trips.

Ninety percent (90%) of the elementary school teachers felt that the students wanted their parents to assist in the building. Fifty one percent (51%) of the junior high teachers and fifty four percent (54%) of the high school teachers agreed that students were in favor of having their parents volunteer in school.

A majority of those surveyed (elementary, 80%, junior high, 73%, and high school, 74%) believe that parents have time available to volunteer in the schools. However, there was a difference among the three groups concerning effective strategies to get

parents involved. There was also disagreement about what types of activities were most appropriate for the volunteers.

All three groups favored the use of parents as chaperones for field trips (elementary, 93%, junior high, 78%, and high school, 92%). However, sixty four percent (64%) of the elementary teachers indicated that parents can be effectively used in classroom areas. Forty nine percent (49%) of the junior high and thirty one percent (31%) of the high school teachers agreed that parents were a valuable resource for classroom teachers.

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as advocates for children. The data regarding Hypothesis 4 are presented in Tables 12 and 13.

The results indicated that there were no significant differences among the three groups concerning parents as advocates for children in the schools. The data regarding Hypothesis 4 are presented in Tables 12 and 13. Hypothesis 4 was accepted.

Table 12

Group Data on Teachers' Attitudes Towards Parents as Advocates

Grade Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Elementary	3.61	.34	88
Junior High	3.48	.35	45
High School	3.63	.32	72
Total	3.59	.34	205

Table 13

Teachers' Attitudes Toward Parents as Advocates: Analysis of the Variance

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	2	.64	.32	2.8458
Within Groups	202	22.78	.11	
Total	204	23.42		

Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents assisting students with school work at home.

The data pertaining to Hypothesis 5 are presented in Tables 14 and 15. The data indicate that there were significant differences among the groups in attitudes toward parents assisting students with school work at home. The Scheffe's Post Hoc Analysis indicated that the elementary school teachers were more positive toward parents assisting children with school work than the junior high and high school teachers. Hypothesis 5 was rejected.

All three groups agreed that parents should supervise homework (elementary, 97%, junior high, 100%, and high school, 97%). Elementary teachers (78%) also strongly endorsed the need for teachers to provide parents with strategies to help students at home. Sixty percent (60%) of the high school teachers and fifty three percent (53%) of the junior high teachers felt that teachers should provide parents with home activities for working with their children.

Table 14

Group Data on Teachers' Attitudes Towards Parents as Tutors

Grade Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Elementary	3.80	.33	88
Junior High	3.62	.41	45
High School	3.57	.56	72
Total	3.68	.38	205

Table 15

Teachers' Attitudes Toward Parents as Tutors: Analysis of the Variance

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	2	2.35	1.17	6.6804
Within Groups	202	27.64	.14	
Total	204	29.99		

Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as an audience in the schools.

The data pertaining to Hypothesis 6 is presented in Tables 16 and 17. The Scheffe' Post Hoc Analysis revealed that significant differences in attitudes occurred between the elementary teachers and the junior high school teachers. Elementary school teachers were more supportive than the junior high teachers toward parent involvement as an audience in the schools. Hypothesis 6 was rejected.

Parents as an audience include those roles where parents receive information about their childrens' progress or attend programs in the school. These activities usually involve the parent being the passive recipient of information from the school.

There was strong agreement among all groups that parents should attend school programs, parents are more likely to attend programs that involve their children, and school programs for parents and the community are a valuable source for public relations.

Examination of the data revealed that seventy percent (70%) of the elementary teachers agreed that conducting programs in the evening would improve parent attendance at school activities. Sixty percent (60%) of the high school teachers also believed that scheduled evening meetings would improve attendance. Fifty percent (50%) of the junior high teachers agree with the value of scheduling evening programs.

Ninety three percent (93%) of the elementary school staff members responded that teachers should actively encourage parents to participate in school programs. Eighty six percent (86%) of the high school staff concurred that teachers should promote parent involvement at school activities. There was seventy six percent (76%) agreement among the junior high staff.

Table 16

Group Data on Teachers' Attitudes Towards Parents as an Audience

Grade Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Elementary	4.27	.39	88
Junior High	4.06	.42	45
High School	4.13	.46	72
Total	4.18	.43	205

Table 17

Teachers' Attitudes Toward Parents as an Audience: Analysis of the Variance

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	2	1.45	.73	3.9978
Within Groups	202	36.72	.18	
Total	204	38.18		

Hypothesis 7: There are no significant differences in attitude among elementary, junior high, and high school teachers concerning the role of parents as learners in the school.

Data pertaining to Hypothesis 7 are located on Tables 18 and 19. The data revealed that there were differences among the groups. The Scheffe' Post Hoc Analysis indicated that high school teachers were significantly more interested in having parents involved as learners in the schools than were junior high teachers. Hypothesis 7 was rejected.

The section of the survey polling teachers' attitudes toward parents as learners examined activities that enable parents to become informed about educational theories and help them to develop strategies for helping their children. The principal difference between this category and parents as an audience is the active participation of the participants as well as the desired condition of learning together with staff members.

Ninety four percent (94%) of the high school teachers stated that adult workshops dealing with parenting skills would improve student performance. Ninety two percent (92%) of the elementary school

teachers also indicated that parent workshops would improve student achievement. Seventy three percent (73%) of the junior high teachers felt such workshops would be beneficial.

High school teachers (60%) and elementary school teachers (61%) believe that the schools should assume the responsibility for organizing and coordinating parenting workshops. Thirty six percent (36%) of the junior high teachers thought that the schools should become involved in providing parenting workshops.

Sixty four percent (64%) of the high school teachers and sixty five percent (65%) of the elementary school teachers were in favor of developing parent information centers in the schools to provide information on topics of concern. Fifty one percent (51%) of the junior high teachers wanted parent information centers.

Table 18

Group Data on Teachers' Attitudes Towards Parents as Learners

Grade Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Elementary	3.56	.59	88
Junior High	3.31	.62	45
High School	3.72	.56	72
Total	3.56	.60	205

Table 19

Teachers' Attitudes Toward Parents as Learners: Analysis of the Variance

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	2	4.55	2.27	6.6804
Within Groups	202	68.73	.34	
Total	204	73.27		

Hypothesis 8: There are no significant differences in attitude among teachers with different levels of professional training toward parent involvement in the school.

Analysis of the data indicate that there is no significant differences in attitude among teachers with various levels of professional training toward parent involvement in the schools. Hypothesis 8 was accepted. The data pertinent to the examination of Hypothesis 8 are located on Tables 20 and 21.

Table 20

Group Data on Levels of Educational Training

Degree Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Bachelor	3.37	.21	71
Bachelor +30	3.43	.17	23
Master	3.36	.22	62
Master +30	3.32	.22	33
CAGS	3.38	.35	15
Doctorate	3.51		1
Total	3.37	.22	205

Table 21

Levels of Educational Training:
Analysis of the Variance

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	5	.21	.04	.8404
Within Groups	199	9.72	.05	
Total	204	9.92		

Hypothesis 9: There are no significant differences in attitude toward parent involvement in the schools among teachers in various age groups.

The data relevant to Hypothesis 9 are presented in Tables 22 and 23. The results reveal that there is no significant difference among teachers in various age groups toward parent involvement in the schools. Hypothesis 9 was accepted.

Table 22

Group Data on Teachers' Attitudes by Age

Age Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
21 to 30	3.44	.18	21
31 to 40	3.36	.18	66
41 to 50	3.39	.25	88
51 and Above	3.30	.23	30
Total	3.37	.22	205

Table 23

Teachers' Attitudes by Age:
Analysis of the Variance

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	3	.29	.10	2.0013
Within Groups	201	9.64	.05	
Total	204	9.92		

Hypothesis 10: There are no significant differences in attitude among teachers who are and are not parents concerning parent involvement in the schools.

Two-tailed t-tests were conducted on each of the seven variables to determine if there were significant differences between teachers who are parents and teachers who are not. The data indicate that there were no significant differences between the two groups concerning parent teacher relationships, parents as decision makers, parents as an audience, and parents as learners.

Significant attitude differences were detected, at the 0.05 level, regarding parents as supporters, parents as advocates, and parents as tutors. The data are listed in Table 24. Hypothesis 10 was rejected.

Fifty four percent (54%) of the teachers who are parents endorsed the use of parent volunteers in classroom areas. Forty percent (40%) of the teachers without children indicated that parent participation in the classroom was desirable.

Fifty three percent (53%) of the teachers with children responded that parents are more likely to volunteer in a school where training is available.

Forty five percent (45%) of the teachers without children concur that schools with training programs were more appealing to parent volunteers than those schools that offered none.

The two groups also differed in views concerning the rights of parents to choose specific teachers for their children, as well as who should be responsible for getting parents involved in the schools.

Sixty five percent (65%) of the teacher/parents responded that parent involvement in the schools is the responsibility of the parents. Fifty one percent (51%) of the teachers without children felt that parent involvement was the obligation of the parents.

Twenty two percent (22%) of the teacher/parents stated that parents should be permitted to select teachers for their children while seventy six percent (76%) responded negatively. Seven percent (7%) of the teachers without children reported that parents should have the right to choose specific teachers for their children.

Table 24

Summary of T-Tests Comparing Attitudes of Teachers With and Without Children Toward Parent Involvement in the School

Category	Mean	SD	t-value	Degree of Freedom	2-tailed Prob.
Relations					
With	3.14	.33	- .14	203	.885
Without	3.15	.36			
Decision Makers					
With	2.55	.71	.38	203	.701
Without	2.51	.66			
Supporters					
With	3.32	.38	-1.42	203	.156 *
Without	3.40	.37			
Advocates					
With	3.61	.37	1.09	203	.275 *
Without	3.55	.26			
Audience					
With	4.18	.46	.20	203	.844
Without	4.17	.38			
Learners					
With	3.55	.62	-.30	203	.767
Without	3.58	.56			
Tutors					
With	3.66	.41	- 1.39	203	.167 *
Without	3.73	.32			

* Significant at <.05

Hypothesis 11: There are no significant differences in attitude toward parent involvement between teachers who have received training in strategies to effectively involve parents in the schools and teachers who have not.

Two-Tailed T-Tests were conducted to examine the differences in attitude between teachers who were trained and those who had not received specialized training in parent involvement strategies. The results revealed that there were no significant differences between the groups regarding parents as supporters, parents as advocates, parents as an audience, parents as learners, and parents as tutors.

However, there were significant differences, at the 0.05 level, between the two groups regarding parent and teacher relations and parent involvement in decision making (Table 25). Hypothesis 11 was rejected.

Trained teachers and those who were not trained both favored parent and teacher relationship activities. The two groups disagreed concerning communication with students' homes about classroom instruction. They also differed in attitude concerning what factors influence parent involvement.

Sixty four percent (64%) of the trained teachers indicated that parents wanted more information sent home about classroom instruction. Forty four percent (44%) of the teachers without training agreed that parents wanted more communication from the schools.

Forty one percent (41%) of the trained teachers responded that parents are not getting involved in education because they have lost confidence in the schools. Twenty three percent (23%) of the untrained teachers believe that parents have lost confidence in the schools.

Teachers who had participated in workshops on parent involvement as well as those teachers who had not participated in training activities both reacted negatively toward parent involvement in decision making roles in the schools. They strongly opposed the idea of parent participation in teacher evaluation and curriculum decisions.

Table 25

Summary of T-Test Comparing Attitudes of Teachers With and Without Training Toward Parent Roles in the Schools

Category	Mean	SD	t-value	Degree of Freedom	2-tailed Prob.
Parent Teacher Relations					
Trained	3.21	.36	1.33	203	.185 *
Not Trained	3.13	.33			
Decision Making					
Trained	2.41	.74	-1.31	203	.191 *
Not Trained	2.57	.68			
Supporters					
Trained	3.35	.46	.06	203	.956
Not Trained	3.35	.36			
Advocates					
Trained	3.57	.31	-.31	203	.754
Not Trained	3.59	.35			
Audience					
Trained	4.15	.43	-.38	203	.705
Not Trained	4.18	.43			
Learners					
Trained	3.56	.72	.03	203	.979
Not Trained	3.56	.57			
Tutors					
Trained	3.68	.41	-.11	203	.914
Not Trained	3.68	.38			

* Significant at <.05

Hypothesis 12: There are no significant difference in attitude among teachers of different genders toward parent involvement in the schools.

Two-tailed T-Tests were conducted in order to compare the response of male and female teachers toward parent involvement in the schools. It was determined that there was a difference in attitudes between male and female teachers concerning all investigated categories of parent involvement.

Further examination of the data disclose that females are more supportive than males toward parent teacher relations, decision making, parents as supporters, parents as advocates, parents as an audience, parents as learners, and parents as tutors. The data are listed in Tables 26. Hypothesis 12 was rejected.

Eighty six percent (86%) of the females believe that teachers should encourage parents to become involved in the school. Sixty seven percent (67%) of the males shared that view.

Male and female participants both overwhelmingly opposed parent involvement in decision making activities, even though thirty eight percent (38%) of

the men and twenty one percent (21%) of the women believe that parents do have the expertise to participate in school decision making.

Seventy three percent (73%) of the women and sixty nine percent (69%) of the men responded that parents should be involved with setting goals for the schools. However, sixty nine percent (69%) of the men opposed parent involvement with curriculum development. Fifty four percent (54%) of the women also rejected this as an appropriate role for parents.

There was agreement among the females (93%) that parent workshops would improve student achievement. Eighty percent (80%) of the men also endorsed parent training programs as an effective strategy for improving student success. Fifty nine percent (59%) of the women indicated that these workshops for parents should be provided by the schools. Forty nine percent (49%) of the men advocated school sponsored workshops.

Both groups supported the concept that parents should supervise homework. However, differences emerged between male and female teachers concerning what the role of the teacher should be in coordinating these home activities. Eighty nine percent (89%) of the females stated that parents want teachers to

provide them with ideas for helping students with schoolwork at home. Sixty six percent (66%) of the men surveyed believe that parents want this assistance from the schools.

Seventy three percent (73%) of the female teachers and sixty one percent (61%) of the male's contend that students like to have their parents actively involved in the building. More female (48%) than male teachers (30%) believe that parents are reluctant to volunteer because they feel that their children do not want them in the school.

A majority of the female teachers (76%) agreed that parents cooperate with teachers to solve student's problems . Fifty six percent (56%) of the men surveyed also agree that parents work with the teachers to resolve situations involving their children.

Table 26

Summary of T-Test Comparing Attitudes of Male and Female Teachers Toward Parent Roles in the School

Category	Mean	SD	Degree of t-value	2-tailed Freedom	Prob.
Parent Teacher Relations					
Male	3.13	.33	-.64	203	.520*
Female	3.16	.34			
Decision Making					
Male	2.38	.65	-2.44	203	.016*
Female	2.62	.70			
Supporters					
Male	3.27	.41	-2.15	203	.033*
Female	3.39	.36			
Advocates					
Male	3.51	.33	-2.48	203	.014*
Female	3.63	.34			
Audience					
Male	4.09	.46	-2.00	203	.047*
Female	4.22	.41			
Learners					
Male	3.45	.66	1.37	203	.049*
Female	3.62	.56			
Tutors					
Male	3.55	.45	-3.64	203	.000*
Female	3.75	.33			

* Significant at <.05

Much of the data analysis in this study has investigated the influence of one independent variable on a dependent variable, with all other variables held constant. Since the results of one way ANOVA's has indicated that gender and grade level are two main factors influencing teacher attitudes toward parent involvement, further investigation was warranted.

Additional examination of these two (2) variables simultaneously, using a two way ANOVA (Table 27), indicated that gender was the main effect influencing teachers' attitudes toward parents as decision makers and advocates. Grade level was the main effect concerning parent and teacher relationships, teachers' as supporters, audiences, and learners. Both variables had similar effects regarding parent as tutors at home for students.

Sometimes, when several independent variables are manipulated together, the results reveal cumulative effects which are above and beyond the effects of the independent variables (Springthall, 1987). In this study, the two independent variables, gender and grade level, did not combine to produce any greater effect. Any interaction effect was the result of chance. Similar analysis of other variables in the study did not provide any significant results.

TABLE 27

Summary of Two-Way Anova:
Gender and Grade Level

Scale	Grade Level (l)	Gender (g)	Interaction l x g
Parent Teacher Relationships			
MS	1.38	.059	.014
F	13.135*	.565	.138
Decision Making			
MS	1.12	2.201	.676
F	2.423	4.781*	1.469
Supporters			
MS	2.24	18.425	.029
F	18.43*	.284	.242
Advocates			
MS	.247	.543	.015
F	2.211	4.864*	.133
Audience			
MS	.505	.294	2.834
F	2.834	1.648	1.648
Learners			
MS	2.158	1.115	.570
F	6.463*	3.460	1.706
Tutor			
MS	.762	1.012	.158
F	5.762*	7.653*	1.195

*p < .05

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion of the Findings

The purpose of this chapter is to further discuss the findings of the study, draw conclusions, and provide recommendations for additional research. Analysis of the findings is based on the hypotheses tested.

A study of two hundred and five (205) public school teachers in a partial regional school district was conducted in order to examine their attitudes toward various forms of parent participation with the schools. Teachers were asked to respond to a fifty (50) statement survey investigating seven categories of parent involvement. These categories included: parent and teacher relationships; parents as supporters; parents as an audience; parents as decision makers; parents as advocates; parents as tutors for their children; and parents as learners.

One purpose of the study was to determine if any differences in attitude existed among these teachers concerning parent participation in the schools. Comparisons were made among the teachers according to

grade level, educational background, age, family status, formal training for parent involvement, years of service, and gender.

Another purpose of the study was to determine what roles teachers perceived to be most appropriate for parents to perform for the schools.

Several interesting patterns emerged from this investigation. The results indicated that there were significant differences among teachers at the elementary, junior high, and high school levels toward parent involvement with the schools.

Other factors also influenced teacher attitudes toward parent participation. A significant difference surfaced between teachers who had received training for parent involvement activities and those who had not participated in any training programs. Teachers who are parents also held views that differed from those who are not parents concerning parent involvement. Examination of the teacher responses by gender revealed that the attitudes of male and female teachers differed concerning parent participation with the schools.

Age, years of experience, and educational background did not significantly affect the attitudes of the teachers who participated in this study.

The analysis of the data indicated that elementary school teachers were significantly more supportive of parent involvement than junior high and high school teachers concerning parent and teacher relationship issues, parents as school supporters, parents as an audience for school activities, parents as adult learners, and parents as home tutors for their children. No measurable differences surfaced concerning parents as advocates or decision makers.

Several factors could influence why teachers at the elementary level have different attitudes than the junior high and high school teachers. There is general agreement among educators that young children are more dependent on their parents than junior high and high school students. Consequently, elementary school teachers need to deal with parents on more of a regular basis.

Teachers of younger children also work with fewer students for a longer period of time during the day. Consequently, they have a better opportunity to focus

their attention on the needs of individual students and can communicate more effectively with parents about ways to assist their children.

Attendance by parents at school programs is better in the elementary schools. Younger children are usually enthusiastic about school activities and tend to be interested in having their parents attend. At the junior high and high school parents are less welcome by the students. Consequently, there is more participation by parents at elementary school functions, suggesting more support for the schools.

Parents' attitudes toward the schools and the teachers could also influence the willingness of those teachers to involve them in school matters. Parents of elementary school children tend to deal with smaller, neighborhood facilities, where they are able to interact with the staff on a personal basis. Junior and senior high schools are usually centralized and present more of a formidable obstacle. This could influence the manner in which parents approach the schools and the teachers.

Junior high and high school teachers differed in attitude concerning parents as learners. High school teachers were more supportive than junior high teachers

of programs that provide adults with parenting skills and strategies to help students. High school teachers also strongly favored the establishment of parent information centers in the schools.

This difference in attitude could be a reflection of the types of activities provided by schools at each level. At the junior high, programs and strategies for servicing youngsters with specific needs exist within the framework of the normal day. The staff deals with students and informs parents of the progress. There are few pull out or alternative programs provided to assist these students. In many instances, teachers and parents appear to be waiting patiently for improvement. Programs available for parents to become informed about school issues or student needs are somewhat limited.

However, at the high school level, numerous alternative programs do exist, and most include a parent component. Parents also become involved with college placement seminars, booster's club activities, and career planning conferences. Consequently, because high school teachers are closely involved with these activities, they may be more positive toward parent education and training programs.

The grade structure and organizational pattern of the schools could also be a factor influencing attitudes. Teachers at the junior high deal with students for two years and then advance them on to the high school for four years. The relatively short period of time that students attend the junior high could influence those teachers' enthusiasm for participation in parent educational activities.

Teachers with children are more supportive than those teachers without children concerning parents as supporters, advocates, and tutors.

Teachers who are parents bring a different perspective to their role as educators than teachers without children. They have experience working with young people as both instructors and as parents. This insight might enable them to better appreciate the value of parent involvement in certain activities. They might also be more sensitive to the needs and feelings of other parents as they deal with teachers and the schools.

Parent involvement training has influenced teacher attitudes toward parent and teacher relationships and decision making. Trained teachers are more interested in communications with parents than

those teachers who are not trained. Furthermore, even though both groups opposed parent involvement in decision making activities, trained teachers were more supportive of some amount of parent participation in this role.

It should be noted that a small number of participants in this study had completed some type of parent involvement training. Of the two hundred and five (205) individuals who responded, thirty nine (39) teachers, or nineteen percent (19%) of the total sample, had been involved with any training program.

Analysis of the data by gender shows that males and females possess different attitudes toward parent participation in the schools. Women were significantly more supportive of all seven (7) categories of parent involvement.

A careful review of the literature and examination of previous parent involvement studies did not provide much insight into this phenomenon. Although instruments developed by other researchers (Williams and Stallworth, 1984; Epstein & Becker, 1987; Kleinstiver,1988) did request gender information as part of the demographic data, no references were made to that variable in their studies.

Female attitudes could be influenced by the fact that women have traditionally served as the primary link between home and school. Even though men do demonstrate interest in their children's education, more women have historically been involved with the day to day supervision of school related issues.

This willingness to involve parents with the schools could also be rooted in the very nature of women. Carol Gilligan (1979) concluded that "sensitivity to the needs of others and the assumption of responsibility for taking care lead women to attend to voices other than their own and to include in their judgements other points of view" (Page 440).

The results of this study established that the two most consequential factors influencing teachers attitudes toward parent involvement are grade level and gender. In order to examine the effects of both of these variables simultaneously, two way analysis of the variance were conducted on the seven categories of parent involvement. The specific details of these tests were reported in Chapter Four.

The results of these two way analyses of variance show that grade level was the main effect influencing teachers' attitudes toward parents as supporters,

parents as an audience, parents as learners, and parent and teacher relationships. Gender was the main effect associated with teachers' views of parents as decision makers and advocates. No clear distinction could be made between the two variables regarding which affects parents as tutors at home for students. It was also concluded that gender and grade level do not produce a significant interaction effect.

Implications

Differences in attitude exist among groups of teachers in the Silver Lake Partial Regional School District concerning parent involvement with the schools. These differences must be addressed in order to more effectively provide opportunities for parents to become involved with the schools.

The results indicate that certain teachers are more supportive of parent involvement roles than others. Those teachers who promote high levels of parent involvement in their classrooms should be complimented and encouraged to continue these activities. However, steps have to be taken to increase all teachers' support for parent involvement activities.

Staff development and in-service programs have to be designed to educate teachers about the benefits of parent involvement and guide them to identify areas of critical need in the district. Workshops should also provide teachers with strategies to effectively initiate parent participation activities in their schools.

A district wide parent involvement philosophy needs to be developed and minimum standards for parent participation established for each grade level. A committee of teachers and administrators representing the elementary, junior high, and high school should meet on a regular basis and review the effectiveness of parent involvement programs in the district.

A parent involvement resource coordinator might be appointed in each building. This individual would be responsible for disseminating information about current practices as well as national, regional, and state reports addressing parent involvement with the schools. A resource center should be developed in each school that would keep pertinent materials within easy access of staff members and parents.

Teachers must be provided with release time to plan parent involvement activities, attend seminars and

workshops, and visit schools that maintain exemplary parent participation programs. This time could also be utilized for parent conferences or developing classroom or department newsletters.

A needs assessment should be administered throughout the district in order to identify what types of training and equipment teachers require in order to meet the established goals for parent involvement.

As teaching positions become available in the district, individuals have to be employed who are knowledgeable and supportive of parent involvement activities.

Teachers and administrators have to become more flexible in scheduling meetings with parents. This could require the modification of existing contractual agreements in order to accommodate the needs of parents who are unable to attend day meetings.

Recommendations for Additional Research

- This study examined teachers attitudes in one partial regional school district. A study which

uses a similar design to the one described in Chapter Three but involves a larger sample population could produce significantly different results.

- A case study of teachers, administrators, parents, taxpayers without children in schools, and political leaders in a community might provide valuable data on ways to improve parent and community involvement in the schools.

- This investigation revealed that male and female teachers possess significantly different attitudes toward parent involvement. Another study could examine why these gender differences exist and what the implications are for staff development programs.

- This study explored teachers' attitudes toward parent involvement in the schools. An analysis of parents' views toward their role, as outlined by the seven (7) categories of parent involvement utilized in this study, might produce useful data for designing parent involvement programs for the schools.

- A study comparing the perceived leadership style of school adminstrators and the attitudes of teachers working in their buildings could provide insight into how the culture and/or climate of a school influences teachers' attitudes toward parent involvement.

- Current research indicates that there is a connection between attitudes and behavior. A study could be designed that examines teacher behaviors toward parent involvement before and after specific parent involvement training.

- This study focused on seven (7) categories of parent involvement with the schools. A study examining other variables related to parent participation might provide further insight into effective strategies for teacher training for parent involvement.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY COVER LETTER

September 15, 1990

Dear Colleague,

Please join me and the University of Masachusetts in a study to examine teacher attitudes toward parent involvement in the public schools. As you are undoubtedly aware, parent involvement in the schools is an issue that is receiving much attention these days.

This study focuses on the attitudes of teachers at the elementary, junior high, and high school level regarding parent involvement. Please take a few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire and return it to the collection box located in your school principal's office.

Note that this is a blind survey, that is, it is not coded in any way that will let us know who did and did not respond. There will be no second mailing, so please use this opportunity to share your views with us concerning parent involvement.

If you would like to discuss any aspect of the questionnaire or parent involvement, please contact me at one of the numbers listed below. For a summary report of this study, fill out the enclosed three by five contact card and include it with your completed questionnaire. The cards and questionnaires will be separated in order to protect your anonymity.

Your input is important and will strengthen the study. Thank you for taking the time to provide it.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph E. Arsenault Jr.

Telephone
Home: (617) 834-8042
Work: (617) 293-5411

APPENDIX B

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SHEET

Biographical Information

This section will provide information on the personal and professional background of the participants.

Q1. Your gender? (Circle number)

1. Male
2. Female

Q2. Highest level of education completed? (Circle number)

1. Bachelors
2. Bachelors + 30
3. Masters
4. Masters + 30
5. Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies
6. Doctorate
7. Other (Specify)_____

Q3. Do you have any children? (Circle number)

1. Yes
2. No

Q4. How many years have you taught? (Specify)
_____ Years

Q5. Which grade level are you presently teaching at? (Circle one)

1. Elementary (Kindergarten to Grade Six)
2. Junior High (Grade Seven and Grade Eight)
3. High School (Grade Nine to Grade Twelve)

Q6. Your Age? (Circle number)

1. 21 to 30
2. 31 to 40
3. 41 to 50
4. 51 or Above

Q7. Have you ever been enrolled in a course or a workshop that dealt with parent involvement in the schools?

1. Yes
2. No

APPENDIX C

TEACHER SURVEY

These Statements are about parent involvement in the schools. For purposes of this study, parent involvement is defined as: The active participation of parents in both classroom/home learning activities and in school decision-making.

Please circle the response that best represents the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SA	A	N	D	SD

1.	Active teacher participation in parent teacher organizations and parent advisory councils increases parent involvement in these groups.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2.	Parents do not have the necessary training to participate in school decision making.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3.	Parents are more likely to attend school programs and assemblies that involve their children	SA	A	N	D	SD
4.	Workshops to instruct parents in strategies to create home conditions for learning would improve student performance.	SA	A	N	D	SD
5.	Students like to have their parents volunteer in the school.	SA	A	N	D	SD
6.	Teachers would participate more in parent involvement activities if there was a parent involvement coordinator in the building.	SA	A	N	D	SD
7.	Teachers need in-service training in order to effectively involve parents in the schools.	SA	A	N	D	SD
8.	Parents want teachers to provide them with ideas for helping children with school work at home.	SA	A	N	D	SD

(Continued on next page)

9.	Many teachers appear to be uncomfortable about communicating with parents.	SA	A	N	D	SD
10.	Parents should participate in the screening and interviewing of new teacher applicants.	SA	A	N	D	SD
11.	Parents attendance at school events has no effect on student performance.	SA	A	N	D	SD
12.	Workshops for parents on ways to build skills in parenting should be provided by the schools.	SA	A	N	D	SD
13.	Parent volunteers in the schools are most effectively utilized in non-classroom areas (i.e., library, office, playground).	SA	A	N	D	SD
14.	Parents should be involved in the placement of their children with specific teachers.	SA	A	N	D	SD
15.	Teacher training in effective parent involvement strategies is not necessary.	SA	A	N	D	SD
16.	Parent involvement in home learning activities makes no diffence in student performance.	SA	A	N	D	SD
17.	Parents appear to be comfortable when they come to the school for a visit.	SA	A	N	D	SD
18.	Parents should be involved with establishing guidelines for grading students.	SA	A	N	D	SD
19.	Parents should be involved with setting goals for their children's school.	SA	A	N	D	SD
20.	School programs (i.e., concerts, plays, science fairs, etc.) are a valuable resource for good public relations with the community.	SA	A	N	D	SD
21.	Teachers should design workshops to help parents understand their children's education at each grade level.	SA	A	N	D	SD
22.	Most parents do not have the time to volunteer in the schools.	SA	A	N	D	SD
23.	Parents should be involved with conducting public relations activities in the community.	SA	A	N	D	SD

(Continued on next page)

24. College students in teacher preparation programs should be trained in strategies for working effectively with parents.	SA	A	N	D	SD
25. Most parents already know how to help students with school work at home.	SA	A	N	D	SD
26. There are not enough opportunities for parents and teachers to talk.	SA	A	N	D	SD
27. Parents should be involved with curriculum development.	SA	A	N	D	SD
28. Parents would attend more school programs if they were scheduled in the evening.	SA	A	N	D	SD
29. Discussion groups between teachers and parents on educational issues would increase parent support for the schools.	SA	A	N	D	SD
30. Parents feel that their children do not want them to volunteer in the schools.	SA	A	N	D	SD
31. Parents are more willing to volunteer in a school where training is available.	SA	A	N	D	SD
32. Parents should be encouraged to observe instructional activities in their child's classroom.	SA	A	N	D	SD
33. Most teachers want in-service training in effective parent involvement strategies.	SA	A	N	D	SD
34. Parents should participate in the evaluation process of their child's teachers.	SA	A	N	D	SD
35. Parents usually cooperate with teachers to solve problems that students experience during the school year.	SA	A	N	D	SD
36. Parents should supervise their children's homework.	SA	A	N	D	SD
37. Teachers should encourage parents to attend school programs.	SA	A	N	D	SD
38. Parents want more information sent home about classroom instruction.	SA	A	N	D	SD

(Continued on next page)

39. Parents should conduct fund raising activities to support school needs.	SA	A	N	D	SD
40. Teachers should provide specific activities that parents and students can do together to improve school work and grades.	SA	A	N	D	SD
41. Parents need to become more active in supporting education (i.e., attending town meeting and voting to support school budget)	SA	A	N	D	SD
42. Parent involvement in the schools is the responsibility of the parents.	SA	A	N	D	SD
43. Parent information centers (equipped with magazines, videos, etc.) should be located in the schools.	SA	A	N	D	SD
44. Parents should chaperone field trips.	SA	A	N	D	SD
45. Most parents are aware of their rights in the schools.	SA	A	N	D	SD
46. Teachers should encourage parents to become volunteers in the school.	SA	A	N	D	SD
47. Parents who are involved in the school become more supportive of education.	SA	A	N	D	SD
48. Many parents do not get involved in education because they have lost confidence in the schools.	SA	A	N	D	SD
49. Parent should have a role in setting promotion and retention standards for students.	SA	A	N	D	SD
50. Parents should be involved with identifying community resources for the school.	SA	A	N	D	SD

Thank you again for taking the time to participate in this study.

APPENDIX D

DECISION MAKING QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GRADE LEVEL

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#34												
Elem.	1	1	5	6	8	9	37	42	37	42	4.18	.89
J.H	-	-	5	11	1	2	16	26	23	5	4.28	.95
H.S.	-	-	10	14	3	4	32	45	27	38	4.18	.90
#49												
Elem.	1	1	15	17	17	19	37	42	18	21	3.64	1.02
J.H.	-	-	5	11	1	2	21	47	18	40	4.17	.92
H.S.	-	-	22	31	10	14	27	38	13	18	3.63	1.02
#2												
Elem.	11	13	45	51	9	10	22	25	1	1	3.49	1.03
J.H.	5	11	20	44	6	13	10	22	4	9	3.24	1.18
H.S.	7	10	45	63	1	1	18	25	1	1	3.49	.94
#27												
Elem.	3	3	17	19	16	18	40	46	12	14	3.47	1.05
J.H.	-	-	6	13	4	9	17	38	18	40	4.07	1.01
H.S.	-	-	9	13	8	11	37	51	18	25	3.66	1.14
#18												
Elem.	1	1	20	23	11	13	32	36	24	27	3.66	1.13
J.H.	-	-	6	13	4	9	17	38	18	40	4.07	1.01
H.S.	-	-	9	13	8	11	37	51	18	25	3.66	1.14
#10												
Elem.	1	1	10	11	9	10	38	43	30	34	3.98	.99
J.H.	-	-	3	7	5	11	15	33	22	49	4.26	.89
H.S.	3	4	5	7	6	8	23	32	35	49	3.98	1.00
#19												
Elem.	5	6	54	61	8	9	18	21	3	3	2.55	.99
J.H.	2	4	28	62	4	9	7	16	4	9	2.67	1.12
H.S.	4	6	53	74	5	7	6	8	4	6	2.55	.99

APPENDIX E
PARENTS AS LEARNERS QUESTIONS
COMPARED BY GRADE LEVEL

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#12												
Elem.	9	10	45	51	20	23	11	13	3	3	2.48	.95
J.H.	6	13	10	22	10	22	10	22	9	20	3.17	1.34
H.S.	12	17	31	43	12	17	12	17	5	7	2.84	1.11
#21												
Elem.	9	10	31	35	17	19	27	31	4	5	2.84	1.11
J.H.	2	4	20	14	6	13	14	31	3	7	2.93	1.09
H.S.	10	14	39	54	10	14	12	17	1	1	2.84	1.11
#4												
Elem.	36	41	45	51	4	5	3	3	-	-	1.70	.71
J.H.	10	22	23	51	3	7	9	20	-	-	2.24	1.00
H.S.	25	35	43	59	2	3	2	3	-	-	1.70	.71
#29												
Elem.	3	3	53	60	17	19	14	16	1	1	2.51	.84
J.H.	1	2	24	53	12	27	8	18	-	-	2.63	.82
H.S.	8	11	44	61	13	18	6	8	1	1	2.51	.84
#43												
Elem.	6	7	51	58	16	18	10	11	5	6	2.51	.97
J.H.	3	7	20	44	15	33	7	16	-	-	2.61	.85
H.S.	10	14	36	50	16	22	8	11	2	3	2.51	.98
# 32												
Elem.	8	9	48	55	9	10	17	19	6	7	2.60	1.10
J.H.	7	16	19	42	6	13	9	20	4	9	2.67	1.22
H.S.	7	10	43	60	13	18	7	10	2	3	2.60	1.10

APPENDIX F

PARENT AND TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GRADE LEVEL

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#35												
Elem.	8	9	64	73	7	8	9	16	-	-	2.19	.74
J.H.	-	-	33	73	5	11	5	11	2	4	2.50	.88
H.S.	-	-	54	75	1	1	17	24	-	-	2.49	.85
#17												
Elem.	9	10	45	52	10	11	24	27	-	-	2.56	.99
J.H.	1	2	13	30	5	11	26	58	-	-	3.24	.94
H.S.	1	1	23	32	12	17	2	3	6	8	3.24	1.03
#1												
Elem.	16	18	47	53	11	13	14	16	-	-	2.26	.94
J.H.	3	6	27	60	10	22	4	9	1	2	2.43	.85
H.S.	14	19	28	39	19	26	10	14	1	1	2.39	.99
#26												
Elem.	3	3	35	40	4	5	40	46	6	7	2.88	1.11
J.H.	-	-	14	31	3	7	26	58	2	4	2.67	.98
H.S.	5	7	19	26	3	4	35	49	10	14	2.86	1.11
#9												
Elem.	4	5	34	39	3	3	44	50	3	3	2.90	1.09
J.H.	1	2	15	33	1	2	26	58	2	4	2.78	1.01
H.S.	2	3	25	35	7	10	35	49	3	4	2.91	1.09
#38												
Elem.	7	8	37	42	29	33	15	17	-	-	2.59	.86
J.H.	2	4	13	29	15	33	15	33	-	-	2.98	.90
H.S.	3	4	36	50	22	31	10	14	1	1	2.9	.86
#48												
Elem.	3	3	13	15	21	24	44	50	7	8	3.44	.95
J.H.	-	-	3	6	9	20	31	69	2	4	3.72	.65
H.S.	3	4	23	32	16	22	27	38	3	4	3.44	.95
#6												
Elem.	9	10	40	46	18	21	17	19	4	5	2.63	1.04
J.H.	1	2	17	38	14	31	12	27	1	2	2.91	.90
H.S.	3	4	32	44	23	32	12	17	2	3	2.63	1.05

APPENDIX G

PARENTS AS AN AUDIENCE QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GRADE LEVEL

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#3												
Elem.	66	75	22	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.25	.43
J.H.	28	62	17	38	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.24	1.00
H.S.	42	58	28	39	-	-	-	-	2	3	1.25	.43
#28												
Elem.	6	7	55	63	9	10	17	19	1	1	2.45	.91
J.H.	1	2	22	49	10	22	12	26	-	3	2.76	.89
H.S.	4	6	9	54	14	19	12	17	3	4	2.45	.92
#11												
Elem.	34	39	50	57	1	1	3	3	-	-	4.30	.66
J.H.	12	27	28	62	2	4	3	7	-	-	4.04	.81
H.S.	26	36	37	51	4	6	5	7	-	-	4.31	.66
#37												
Elem.	25	28	57	65	3	3	3	3	-	-	1.81	.65
J.H.	5	11	29	64	8	18	3	7	-	-	2.20	.71
H.S.	20	28	42	58	8	11	1	1	1	1	1.81	.65
#20												
Elem.	50	57	38	43	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.43	.50
J.H.	25	56	20	44	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.46	.50
H.S.	34	47	36	50	2	3	-	-	-	-	1.43	.50

APPENDIX H

PARENTS AS TUTORS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GRADE LEVEL

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#8												
Elem.	17	19	61	69	6	7	3	3	1	1	1.98	.71
J.H.	10	22	23	51	4	9	8	18	-	-	2.26	1.01
H.S.	11	15	44	61	4	6	13	18	-	-	1.98	.71
#36												
Elem.	31	35	54	61	2	2	1	1	-	-	1.69	.57
J.H.	15	33	30	67	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.65	.48
H.S.	-	-	27	38	43	60	2	3	-	-	1.69	.57
#25												
Elem.	1	1	9	10	5	6	69	78	4	5	3.75	.74
J.H.	-	-	5	11	6	13	31	69	3	7	3.72	.74
H.S.	1	1	5	7	3	4	50	69	13	18	3.75	.74
#40												
Elem.	17	19	51	58	7	8	13	15	-	-	2.18	.91
J.H.	2	4	22	49	6	13	12	27	3	7	2.80	1.07
H.S.	8	11	35	49	10	14	16	22	3	4	2.18	.91

APPENDIX I

PARENTS AS ADVOCATES QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GRADE LEVEL

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#23												
Elem.	12	14	52	59	19	22	4	5	1	1	2.20	.77
J.H.	4	9	27	60	11	24	3	7	-	-	2.28	.77
H.S.	11	15	49	68	11	15	1	1	-	-	2.20	.77
#14												
Elem.	-	-	15	17	10	11	39	44	24	27	3.82	1.02
J.H.	1	2	6	13	2	4	19	42	17	38	4.00	1.06
H.S.	1	1	12	17	8	11	39	45	12	17	3.82	1.01
#50												
Elem.	23	26	58	66	6	7	1	1	-	-	1.83	.59
J.H.	4	9	34	76	7	16	-	-	-	-	2.07	.48
H.S.	17	24	48	67	6	8	-	-	1	1	1.83	.59
#45												
Elem.	1	1	33	38	15	17	34	39	5	6	3.10	1.01
J.H.	-	-	13	29	3	7	27	60	2	4	3.37	.96
H.S.	2	3	15	21	12	17	35	49	8	11	3.10	1.01
#47												
Elem.	35	40	46	52	4	5	3	3	-	-	1.71	.71
J.H.	10	22	29	64	5	11	1	2	-	-	1.93	.64
H.S.	25	35	40	56	5	7	2	3	-	-	1.72	.71
#41												
Elem.	51	58	34	39	3	3	-	-	-	-	1.45	.56
J.H.	24	53	20	44	1	2	-	-	-	-	1.50	.54
H.S.	39	54	31	43	1	1	1	1	-	-	1.45	.56
#42												
Elem.	13	15	33	38	17	19	24	27	1	1	2.63	1.0
J.H.	7	16	21	47	7	16	10	22	-	-	2.43	.99
H.S.	17	24	34	47	4	6	17	24	-	-	2.63	1.07

APPENDIX J

PARENTS AS SUPPORTERS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GRADE LEVEL

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#5												
Elem.	26	30	53	60	4	5	4	5	1	1	1.88	.78
J.H.	2	4	21	47	10	22	9	20	3	7	2.78	1.02
H.S.	3	4	36	50	15	21	18	25	-	-	1.88	.78
#22												
Elem.	-	-	9	10	9	10	55	63	15	17	2.14	.81
J.H.	-	-	6	13	6	13	30	67	3	7	2.37	.82
H.S.	-	-	10	14	9	13	44	61	9	13	2.14	.81
#46												
Elem.	15	17	58	66	11	13	4	5	-	-	2.05	.69
J.H.	1	2	27	60	9	20	6	13	2	4	2.57	.90
H.S.	8	11	41	57	17	24	4	6	2	3	2.05	.69
#13												
Elem.	4	5	21	24	7	8	48	55	8	9	3.40	1.08
J.H.	1	2	17	38	5	11	20	44	2	4	3.09	1.04
H.S.	3	4	29	40	18	25	19	26	3	4	3.40	1.08
#30												
Elem.	4	5	55	63	18	21	10	11	1	1	3.58	.79
J.H.	5	11	16	36	11	24	9	20	4	9	2.78	1.14
H.S.	13	18	31	43	15	21	9	13	4	6	1.89	.73
#44												
Elem.	4	27	58	66	5	6	1	1	-	-	1.81	.58
J.H.	5	11	30	68	8	18	2	4	-	-	2.15	.66
H.S.	16	22	50	69	2	3	2	3	2	3	1.81	.58
#31												
Elem.	2	2	47	53	25	28	14	16	-	-	2.58	.78
J.H.	1	2	18	40	20	44	6	13	-	-	2.72	.74
H.S.	6	8	29	40	25	35	11	15	1	1	2.58	.78

APPENDIX K

PARENT AND TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY TEACHER TRAINING

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#35												
N.T.	7	4	122	74	10	6	25	15	2	1	3.64	3.17
T.	1	2	29	74	3	8	6	15	-	-	3.64	3.17
#17												
N.T.	9	5	66	40	22	13	66	40	3	2	3.07	1.78
T	2	5	15	38	5	13	14	40	3	8	2.97	1.69
#1												
N.T.	25	15	83	50	36	22	19	11	3	2	3.66	1.92
T.	8	21	19	49	4	10	8	21	-	-	3.69	2.26
#26												
N.T	14	8	87	52	10	6	49	30	6	4	3.33	2.50
T.	4	10	14	36	-	-	19	49	2	5	2.97	2.07
#9												
N.T.	7	4	86	52	8	5	59	36	6	4	3.17	2.52
T.	4	10	19	49	-	-	15	39	1	2	3.26	2.54
#38												
N.T.	6	4	67	40	59	36	33	20	1	.6	3.27	.27
T.	6	15	19	49	7	18	77	18	-	-	2.85	1.35
#48												
N.T.	6	4	32	19	45	27	75	45	8	5	3.32	1.41
T.	3	8	14	36	10	26	10	26	2	5	3.15	.73
#6												
N.T.	10	4	75	8	45	8	31	4	5	.6	3.32	1.41
T.	3	8	14	36	10	26	10	26	2	5	3.15	.73

Code

N.T. = Not trained
T. = Trained

APPENDIX L

PARENTS AS DECISION MAKERS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY TEACHER TRAINING

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#34												
N.T.	1	.6	19	11	9	5	65	39	72	44	1.88	.10
T.	-	-	1	2	3	8	18	46	17	44	1.69	1.16
#49												
N.T.	3	1	45	27	21	13	63	40	34	21	2.35	.54
T.	2	5	9	23	5	13	12	31	11	28	2.21	1.20
#2												
N.T.	3	1	40	24	11	7	93	56	19	11	2.49	1.31
T.	-	-	4	10	9	23	15	39	11	28	2.15	.58
#27												
N.T.	3	1	47	28	21	13	77	46	18	11	2.18	.35
T.	-	-	4	10	9	23	15	39	11	28	2.15	1.72
#18												
N.T.	1	.6	28	17	18	11	72	43	47	28	2.18	.35
T.	-	-	7	18	5	13	14	36	13	33	2.05	.58
#10												
N.T.	3	2	13	8	16	10	62	37	72	43	1.87	1.13
T.	-	-	7	18	5	13	14	36	13	33	2.05	.90
#19												
N.T.	9	5	110	66	16	10	24	15	7	4	3.54	2.86
T.	2	5	25	64	1	2	7	18	4	10	3.36	2.92

Code

N.T. = Not trained
T. = Trained

APPENDIX M

PARENTS AS SUPPORTERS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY FAMILY STATUS

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#5												
C.	22	16	73	55	19	14	16	12	4	3	3.70	2.38
N.C.	9	13	37	52	10	14	15	21	-	-	3.56	2.21
#22												
C.	15	11	85	63	14	10	20	15	-	-	3.76	2.76
N.C.	10	14	42	59	8	11	10	14	1	1	3.79	2.70
#46												
C.	15	11	80	60	14	10	20	15	-	-	3.69	2.39
N.C.	9	13	46	65	12	14	3	4	1	1	3.83	2.69
#13												
C.	3	2	40	30	19	14	59	44	13	10	2.69	1.13
N.C.	5	7	27	38	10	14	28	39	1	1	3.14	1.66
#30												
C.	-	-	40	30	33	25	59	44	2	1	3.56	1.83
N.C.	2	3	21	30	23	32	22	31	3	4	2.96	1.24
#39												
C.	21	16	64	48	46	34	17	13	-	-	4.05	2.86
N.C.	23	32	29	41	28	39	11	16	-	-	4.10	2.06
#44												
C.	33	25	84	63	10	8	5	4	2	1	4.05	1.28
N.C.	12	14	54	76	5	7	-	-	-	-	4.10	3.30
#31												
C.	6	5	65	49	46	34	17	13	-	-	3.43	1.28
N.C.	3	4	29	41	28	39	11	16	-	-	3.31	.65

Code

C. = Teachers who have their own children
N.C. = Teachers who do not have their own children

APPENDIX N

PARENTS AS ADVOCATES QUESTIONS COMPARED BY FAMILY STATUS

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#23												
C.	14	10	84	63	29	22	6	5	1	.7	3.79	2.47
N.C.	12	14	44	62	13	18	2	3	-	-	3.93	2.58
#14												
C.	2	1	28	21	11	8	61	46	32	24	2.31	.92
N.C.	-	-	5	7	12	14	41	58	13	18	1.97	1.26
#50												
C.	30	22	89	66	14	10	-	-	1	1	4.09	2.9
N.C.	15	21	50	70	5	7	1	1	-	-	4.11	3.15
#45												
C.	3	2	40	30	19	14	59	29	12	9	2.70	1.19
N.C.	-	-	22	31	12	17	34	48	3	4	2.74	1.15
#47												
C.	49	37	66	49	14	10	12	6	-	-	4.26	2.60
N.C.	21	30	43	61	3	4	4	6	-	-	4.14	2.93
#41												
C.	69	51	60	45	1	3	4	3	-	-	4.47	2.53
N.C.	45	63	25	35	1	1	-	-	-	-	4.63	2.25
#42												
C.	27	20	60	45	16	12	30	22	1	1	3.63	2.10
N.C.	9	13	27	38	13	18	22	31	-	-	3.35	1.41

Code

C. = Teachers who have their own children
N.C. = Teachers who do not have their own children

APPENDIX O

PARENTS AS TUTORS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY FAMILY STATUS

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#8												
C.	26	19	79	59	10	8	18	13	1	1	3.83	2.71
N.C.	12	14	49	6	4	6	6	8	-	-	3.94	3.11
#36												
C.	41	31	89	66	2	1	2	1	-	-	4.26	3.19
N.C.	32	45	38	54	-	-	1	1	-	-	4.43	2.85
#25												
C.	2	1	13	10	11	8	99	74	9	7	2.26	.61
N.C.	-	-	6	8	3	4	51	72	11	16	2.06	.38
#40												
C.	16	12	64	48	18	13	31	23	5	4	3.41	2.06
N.C.	11	16	44	62	5	7	10	14	1	1	3.76	2.84
#16												
C.	-	-	3	2	4	3	46	34	81	60	1.47	.75
N.C.	1	1	1	1	-	-	33	47	37	52	1.53	.64

Code

C. = Teachers who have their own children
N.C. = Teachers who do not have their own children

APPENDIX P

PARENT AND TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GENDER

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#35												
MALE	-	-	56	80	3	4	11	16	-	-	2.36	.74
FEMALE	8	6	95	10	7	20	15	2	2	2	2.36	.86
#17												
MALE	1	1	27	39	8	11	33	47	1	1	3.09	.98
FEMALE	10	7	54	40	19	14	47	35	5	4	2.87	1.08
#1												
MALE	13	19	44	63	7	10	6	9	-	-	2.09	.79
FEMALE	20	15	58	43	33	24	22	16	2	2	2.47	.98
#26												
MALE	4	6	18	26	5	7	36	51	7	10	2.66	1.13
FEMALE												
#9												
MALE	2	3	18	26	1	1	46	66	3	4	2.57	1.01
FEMALE	5	4	56	42	7	5	59	44	8	6	2.63	1.11
#38												
MALE	6	9	26	37	24	34	13	19	1	1	2.67	.92
FEMALE	6	4	60	44	42	31	27	20	-	-	2.67	.84
#48												
MALE	2	3	14	20	15	21	35	50	4	6	3.36	.96
FEMALE	4	3	25	19	31	23	67	50	8	6	3.37	.95
#6												
MALE	1	1	35	50	21	30	12	17	1	1	2.67	.82
FEMALE	12	9	54	40	34	25	29	22	6	4	2.73	1.04

APPENDIX Q

PARENTS AS DECISION MAKERS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GENDER

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#34												
MALE	-	-	6	9	5	7	21	30	38	54	4.30	.93
FEMALE	1	.7	14	10	7	5	64	47	49	36	4.08	.94
#49												
MALE	-	-	14	20	9	13	27	39	20	29	3.76	1.07
FEMALE	1	.7	28	21	19	14	58	43	29	22	3.64	1.06
#2												
MALE	6	9	33	47	4	6	21	30	6	9	3.17	1.19
FEMALE	17	13	77	57	12	9	29	22	-	-	3.61	.96
#27												
MALE	1	1	16	23	5	7	32	46	16	23	3.66	1.11
FEMALE	2	2	35	26	25	19	60	44	13	10	3.35	1.01
#18												
MALE	-	-	7	10	7	10	36	51	20	29	3.99	.89
FEMALE	1	.7	28	21	16	12	50	37	40	30	3.74	1.12
#10												
MALE	2	3	4	6	2	3	27	39	35	50	4.27	.97
FEMALE	2	2	14	10	18	13	49	36	52	39	4.00	1.03
#19												
MALE	4	6	44	63	5	7	12	17	5	7	2.57	1.06
FEMALE	7	5	91	67	12	9	19	14	6	4	2.45	.9

APPENDIX R

PARENTS AS AN AUDIENCE QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GENDER

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#3												
MALE	44	63	24	34	2	3	-	-	-	-	1.40	.55
FEMALE	92	68	43	32	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.32	.47
#28												
MALE	3	4	39	56	13	19	12	17	3	4	4.07	.82
FEMALE	8	6	77	57	20	15	29	22	1	.7	2.54	.92
#11												
MALE	20	29	41	59	3	4	6	9	-	-	4.07	.82
FEMALE	52	39	74	55	4	3	5	4	-	-	4.28	.70
#37												
MALE	12	17	47	67	9	13	1	1	1	1	2.03	.70
FEMALE	38	28	81	60	10	7	6	4	-	-	1.88	.72
#20												
MALE	33	47	35	50	2	3	-	-	-		1.56	.55
FEMALE	76	56	59	44	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.44	.50

APPENDIX S

PARENTS AS LEARNERS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GENDER

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#12												
MALE	8	11	26	37	13	19	13	19	10	14	2.87	1.25
FEMALE	19	14	60	44	29	22	20	15	7	5	2.65	1.08
#21												
MALE	7	10	28	40	11	16	22	31	2	3	2.77	1.08
FEMALE	14	10	62	46	22	16	31	23	6	4	2.65	1.08
#4												
MALE	24	34	32	46	4	6	10	14	-	-	2.00	.99
FEMALE	47	35	79	59	5	4	4	3	-	-	1.75	.66
#29												
MALE	3	4	41	59	17	24	9	13	-	-	2.46	.77
FEMALE	9	7	80	59	25	19	19	14	2	2	2.44	.87
#43												
MALE	6	9	36	51	19	27	7	10	2	3	2.47	.89
FEMALE	13	10	71	53	28	21	18	13	5	4	2.49	.97
#32												
MALE	5	7	37	53	7	10	13	19	8	11	2.74	1.18
FEMALE	17	13	73	54	21	16	20	15	4	3	2.41	.98

APPENDIX T

PARENTS AS SUPPORTERS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GENDER

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#5												
MALE	4	6	39	56	13	19	13	19	1	1	2.54	.91
FEMALE	27	20	71	53	16	12	18	13	3	2	2.25	.99
#22												
MALE	-	-	10	14	11	15	42	60	7	10	2.34	.84
FEMALE	-	-	15	11	13	10	87	64	20	15	2.17	.72
#46												
MALE	7	10	40	57	13	19	6	9	4	6	2.43	.98
FEMALE	17	13	86	64	24	18	8	6	-	-	2.17	.72
#13												
MALE	5	7	27	39	11	16	24	34	3	4	2.90	1.08
FEMALE	3	2	40	30	19	14	63	47	10	7	3.27	1.04
#30												
MALE	1	1	20	29	25	36	24	34	-	-	2.97	.83
FEMALE	4	3	61	45	31	23	37	27	2	1	3.21	.93
#39												
MALE	9	13	30	43	15	21	9	13	7	10	2.07	.78
FEMALE	35	26	66	49	21	16	12	9	1	.7	2.10	.91
#44												
MALE	13	19	44	63	9	13	3	4	1	1	2.59	.75
FEMALE	7	5	61	45	42	31	25	19	-	-	2.63	.84
#31												
MALE	2	3	33	47	28	40	6	9	1	1	2.59	.75
FEMALE	7	5	61	45	42	31	25	19	-	-	2.63	.84

APPENDIX U

PARENTS AS ADVOCATES QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GENDER

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#23												
MALE	8	11	46	66	12	17	3	4	1	1	2.19	.74
FEMALE	19	14	82	61	29	22	5	4	-	-	2.15	.69
#14												
MALE	-	-	12	17	4	6	36	51	18	26	3.86	.99
FEMALE	2	2	21	16	16	12	61	45	35	26	3.79	1.04
#50												
MALE	8	11	54	77	7	10	-	-	1	1	2.03	.99
FEMALE	36	27	86	64	12	9	1	.7	-	-	1.84	.60
#45												
MALE	-	-	15	21	9	13	39	56	7	10	3.54	.94
FEMALE	3	2	46	34	21	16	57	42	8	6	3.16	1.03
#47												
MALE	22	31	38	54	8	11	2	3	-	-	1.86	.72
FEMALE	48	36	77	57	6	4	4	3	-	-	1.75	.67
#41												
MALE	31	44	37	53	1	1	1	1	-	-	1.60	.60
FEMALE	83	62	48	36	4	3	-	-	-	-	1.41	.55
#42												
MALE	12	17	34	49	10	14	13	19	1	1	2.90	1.06
FEMALE	10	7	48	36	26	19	44	33	7	5	2.93	1.09

APPENDIX V

PARENTS AS TUTORS QUESTIONS COMPARED BY GENDER

	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%	MEAN	S.D.
#8												
MALE	13	19	33	47	9	13	14	20	1	1	2.39	1.05
FEMALE	25	19	95	70	5	4	10	8	-	-	2.00	.72
#36												
MALE	-	-	20	29	49	70	1	1	-	-	1.74	.53
FEMALE	53	39	78	58	2	2	2	2	-	-	1.65	.59
#25												
MALE	-	-	9	13	6	9	50	71	5	7	3.73	.77
FEMALE	2	2	10	7	8	6	100	74	15	11	3.86	.76
#40												
MALE	7	10	31	44	10	14	16	23	6	9	2.76	1.16
FEMALE	20	15	77	57	13	10	25	19	-	-	2.32	.94
#16												
MALE	34	49	30	43	4	6	2	3	-	-	4.37	.72
FEMALE	84	62	49	36	-	-	1	.7	1	.7	4.59	.61

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amundson, K.J. (1988). First teachers: Parental involvement in the public schools, Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.

Arnstein, S. (1979). A ladder of citizen participation. Journal of American Institute of Planners, 35, 8-10.

Barth, R. (1979). Home based reinforcement of school behavior: A review and analysis. Review of educational research, 49, 436-58.

Becker, H.J. & Epstein, J.L.(1982). Parent involvement: A survey of teacher practices. The Elementary School Journal, 83(2).

Becker, R.M. (1984). Parent Involvement: A review of research and principles of successful practice. National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C.

Benson, C., Buckley,S., & Medrich, E.A. (1980) Families as educators: Time use Contributions to school achievement. In J. Guthrie, (ed) School Finance Policy in the 1980's: A Decade of Conflict. Cambridge: Ballinger.

Bloom, B.S. (1985). Developing talent in young people. New York: Ballantine Books.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1974). A report of longitudinal evaluations of preschool programs. Vol. II: Is Early Intervention Effective? Office of Child Development. DHEW

Brouillet, F.B. (1986). Interact - a plan for participation in home & family programs. Olympia, WA: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Carter, D. (1982). Addressing school discipline: The national pta response. PTA Today, 8(1), 25-26.

Chavkin, N.F. & Williams, D.L. (1987). Enhancing parent involvement. Guidelines for access to an important resource for school administrators. Education and Urban Society, 19, 164-183.

Chavkin, N.F. & Williams, D.L., Jr. (1985). Executive summary of the final report: Parent involvement in education project. Austin, Tx: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Clay, P.L. (1981). Single parents and the public schools: How does the partnership work. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Coleman, J.S., et al. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Coleman, J.S. (1987, April). Families and schools. Paper presented at the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Comer, J.P, (1988, January). Is parenting essential to good teaching?. NEA Today, 6(6) p34-40.

Comer, J.P. (1982, November). Parent participation: A key to school improvement. Citizen Action in Education, 20.

Comer, J.P. (February, 1986) Parent participation in the schools. Phi Delta Kappan, (67), 442-446.

Comer, J. (1978) Relationships between the school and home. Connecticut. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 178 162)

Comer, J.P. (1980) School power. The Free Press: New York, New York.

Cone, J.D. & others (1985). Parent participation: The parent/family involvement index. Exceptional Children, 51(5).

Davies, D. (1985). Parent Involvement in the Public Schools in the 1980's: Proposals, issues, opportunities. Paper presented at the Research for Better Schools Conference, Philadelphia, PA, May 9-10,

Davis, F. (1984). Understanding underachievers. American education, 20(10), 12-14.

Deal, A. (1987, March). Family focused services of the family, infant, and preschool program. In Linking programs and resources for rural special education. Presented to the National Conference of the American Council on Rural Special Education, North Carolina.

Dove, L.A. (1982). Lifelong teacher education and the community school. Hamburg, IL:

Education Commission of the States, (1988). Drawing in the family. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Elkind, D. (1982). The hurried child: Growing up too fast, too soon. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Epstein, Joyce, (1983) Effects on parents of teacher practices of parent involvement. John Hopkins University., Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Epstein, J. (Winter, 1988). How do we improve programs for parent involvement. Educational Horizons, 66(2), pp 58-59

Epstein, J. (January, 1987). What principals should know about parent involvement. Principal.

Epstein, J.:., & Becker, H.J., (1987). Hopkins surveys of schools and family connections: Questionnaires for teachers, parents and students. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University, Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Epstein, J.L., & Becker, H.J., (1982, November). Teacher practices of parent involvement: Problems and possibilities. Elementary School Journal, 83, 103-113.

Epstein, J.L., & Dauber, S.L. (1989). Teachers attitudes and practices of parent involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools (Rep. No. 42). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University, Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Fantini, M.D., (1980). Community participation: Alternative patterns and their consequences of education achievement. In R. L. Sinclair (ed.) A Two Way Street. Boston: Institute For Responsive Education, 14-18.

Fine, M.J., & Holt, P. (1983). Intervening with school problems: A family systems perspective. Psychology in the Schools, 20(1), 59-66.

Fiordaliso, R., Lordeman, A., Filipczak, J., & Friedman, R.M. (1977). Effects of feedback on absenteeism in the junior high school. The Journal of Educational Research,70, 188-192.

Fiske, E.B. (1989, November). Linking schools and jobs: Educators, executives seek system to inspire high school students. The Patriot Ledger, p. 22.

Fruchter, N. (1984). The role of parent participation. Social Policy, 15(2), 32-36

Fruchter, N., Silvestri, K.L. & Green, H. (1985). Public policy and public schools - a training program for parents. Urban Education, 20, 199-203

Frymier, J. (1985). Methods of achieving parent partnerships. Indianapolis, IN: Indianapolis Public Schools.

Gilligan, C. (1979). Woman's place in man's life cycle. Harvard Educational Review, 49, 440-444.

Gilmore, J. (1985). Improving the attendance of primary children by involving parents in their education. Illinois: Nova University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 941.

Good, C.U., (1973). Dictionary of education. (3rd ed.) New York: NY: McGraw Hill.

Goodson, B.D., & Hess, R.D. Parents as Teachers of Young Children: An Evaluative Review of Some Contemporary Concepts and Programs. Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, DHEW, Office of Education, Washington, DC. May 1975 (Henderson)

Gordon, Ira (1978). What does research say about the effects of parent involvement on schooling. Paper for the annual meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gotts, E.E. & Purnell, R.P (1987). Practicing school-family relations in urban settings. Urban Society, 19, 212-218.

Griffore, R.J. (1979). Factors associated with black parent participation and non-participation in voluntary school desegregation. Educational Research Quarterly, 4(4)

Gross, M. (1974). Human efforts in elevating achievement at the wheatley school. Washington, D.C.: Ed. D. Practicum, Nova University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 102 661).

Guilford, J.P., & Fruchter, B., (1977). Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. 6th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Harris, L., (Ed.). (1987). The metropolitan life survey of the american teacher 1987: Strengthening links between home and school. New York: Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

Heleen, O. (1988). Involving the hard to reach parent: A working model. Equity and Choice, 4(3), 60-63.

Henderson, A.T. (1987). The evidence continues to grow parent involvement improves student achievement. Columbia, Maryland: National Committee For Citizens In Education

Henderson, A.T. (1988) Parents are a schools best friends. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 148-153.

Henderson, P.A. (1987). Effects of planned parent involvement in affective education. School Counselor, 35(1), 22-27.

Herman, J.L, & Yeh, J.P. (1983). Some effects of parent involvement in schools. The Urban Review, 15(1), 11-17.

Hirsch, E.S. (1986). Parent attitudes change through involvement: An examination of the dynamics that can facilitate parent growth in pre-school settings. Paper presented at the World Organization for Early Childhood Education (O.M.E.P.) World Congress, Jerusalem, Israel, July 13-17. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 289 607).

Jencks, C. (1972). The coleman report and the conventional wisdom. In F. Mosteller & D. Moynihan (Ed.) On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Vintage Press.

Jennings, L. (1990). Studies link parental involvement, higher student achievement. Education Week, 9 (28), 20-21.

Johnston, M. & Slotkin, J (1985, February). Parent participation in the schools: Are the benefits worth the burdens? Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 430-33.

Jones, B.J. & Maloy, R.W. (1988). Partnerships for improving schools. New York: Greenwood Press.

Kagan, S.L. (1984). Parent involvement research: a field in search of itself. Boston, MA: Institute for Responsive Education.

Kagan, S.L. & Schraft, C.M. (1981). Developing parent school collaboration: A guide for school personnel. In S.L. Kagan & C.M. Schraft (Eds.), When parents and schools come together. Boston, MA: Institute for Responsive Education.

Kleinsteiver, E.J. (1988). A comparative study of attitudes about parental involvement as perceived by teachers and principals in selected public elementary schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: Northern Arizona University.

Lally, J.R. (1971). Infancy to three years of age. In A. N. Charters (Ed.), Notes and essays on education for adults: Toward the educative society. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Langenbrunner, M., & Thornburg, K. (1980). Attitudes of preschool directors, teachers, and parents toward parent involvement in schools. Reading Improvement, 17, 286-291.

Lazar, I., & Darlington, R., (1978). Summary: Lasting effects after pre-school. Ithica, NY: Cornell University.

Leler, Hazel (1983). Parent education and involvement in relation to the schools and to the parents of school-aged children. In Ron Haskins and Dianne Adams (ed), Parent Education and Public Policy, Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co.

Lightfoot, S.L. (1981). Toward conflict and resolution: Relations between families and schools. Theory into Practice, 20(2), 97-103.

Lightfoot, S.L. (1978). Worlds apart: Relationships between families and schools. New York: Basic Books.

Linder, B. (1988). Drawing in the family: Family involvement in the schols. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Mayeske, G.W. (1973). A study of the achievement of our nation's students. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

McAfee, O. (1987, February). Improving home-school relations: Implications for staff development. Education and Urban Society, 19(2),

Merenda, D.W.(1989). Partners in education: An old tradition renamed. Eduactional Leadership, 47 (2) 4-7.

Mize, G.K. (1977). The influence of increased parental involvement in the educational process of their children. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, Technical Report No. 418. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 151 661)

Moles, O.C. (1982). Synthesis of recent research on parent participation in children's education. Educational leadership, 40(2), 44-47.

Moles, O.C.(1987). Who wants parent involvement: Interest, skills, and opportunities among parents and educators. Education and urban society, 19, 137-145.

Moore, A.R., (1986). Teacher attitudes and behavior toward parent education and parent involvement (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49 09A.

National School Public Relations Association, (1987). Communication tips and techniques, Arlington, VA: National School Public Relations Association.

Nebor, J.N. (1986). Parental influence and involvement on reading achievement. Illinois. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286 150)

Olson, L. (1990). Parents as partners: Redefining the social contract between families and schools. Education Week, 9 (28), pg 1.

Phillips, G., & Rosenberger, T. (1983). Breaking the failure cycle in an inner-city high school. NASSP Bulletin, 67(466), 30-35.

Phillips, S.D, Smith, M.C., & Witte, J.F. (1985). Parents and schools. Staff report to the Study Commission on the Quality of Education in the Metropolitan Milwaukee Schools: Milwaukee, WI.

Raynolds, H. (1990) Parents and schools: A critical resource link. Boston, MA: State Department of Education.

Reese, W.J. (1978) Between home and school: organized parents, clubwomen, and urban education in the progressive era. School Review, 3-28.

Rich, Dorothy (1988). Bridging the parent gap in education reform. Educational Horizons 66(2)

Sattes, B.D.,(1984). Parent involvement: A review of the literature. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Schaefer, E.S. (1971). Toward a revolution in education. National Elementary Principal, 51 (1), 18-25.

Scott-Jones, D. (1984). Family influence on cognitive development and school achievement. In E.W. Gordon, (Ed.) Review of Research in Education 11. Washington, D.C.: American Education Research Association.

Silvestri, K. (1981) The school - community education paradox: The beginning of a proposed solution. Dissertation Abstracts International 42(5),

Springthall, R.C. (1987). Basic statistical analysis. (2nd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Stallworth, N. (1982). Identifying barriers to parent involvement in the schools: A survey of educators. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Stallworth, J.T., & Williams, D.L., Jr. (1982). A survey of parents regarding parent involvement in schools (Executive summary). Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Stearns, M.S. & Peterson, S. (1973). Parent involvement compensatory education programs: Definitions and findings, Menlo Park Education Policy Research Center, Stanford Research Institute.

Stenner, A.J., & Mueller, S.G. (December, 1973). A successful compensatory education model. Phi Delta Kappan, 55, 247.

Swap, S.M., (1987). Enhancing parent involvement in schools. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Tangri, S.S. & Leitch, M.L. (1982). Barriers to home-school collaboration: Two case studies in junior high schools. Final report submitted to the National Institute of Education. Washington, D.C. The Urban Institute.

Tudor, K. (1977). An exploratory study of teacher attitude and behavior toward parent education and involvement. Educational Research Quarterly, 2, 22-28.

Turner, T. (1985). Learning how to learn: An affective curriculum for students at risk of dropping out of school. Danbury, CT: Union Carbide Corportaion.

U.S. Department of Education. (1987). Education and the family. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van-Devender, E.M (1988) Involving parents: How and why. Academic Therapy 23, 523-28

Wagenaar, T.C. (1977, September). School achievement level vis-vis community involvement and support: An empirical assessment. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Sociological Association, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Walberg, H.J. (1984). Families as partners in educational productivity. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 397-400.

Walberg, H.J., Bole, R.E., & Waxman, H.C. (1980). School based socialization and reading achievement in the inner city. Psychology in the schools, 17 509-514.

White, J,R., (1983). Parent participation in decision making as perceived by parents, teachers, principals, and board members. A summary report. Ontario: Canada, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 249 569)

Williams, D., and Stallworth, J.(1984) Executive Summary: Parent Involvement In Education Project. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Williams, E., & Lizotte, J. (1985). Parents as partners in education: Project pipe. Findlay, OH: Bowling Green State University, Blanchard Valley Center.